DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 473 CG 014 326

AUTHOR Matthews, Martha; McCune, Shirley
TITLE The Context of Title IX: Outlines and Participants' Materials for Generic Session One. Implementing Title IX and Attaining Sex Equity: A Workshop Package for Postsecondary Educators.
INSTITUTION National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, Washington, D.C. Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education.
SPONS AGENCY Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Women's Educational Equity Act Program.
PUB DATE Sep 78
CONTRACT 300-76-0456
NOTE 87p.; For related documents see CG 014 321-325, ED 155 498-508 and CG 014 392.
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Administration; College Faculty; Educational Legislation; Educational Practices; *Equal Education; *Federal Legislation; Inservice Education; Postsecondary Education; *Program Development; *Sex Discrimination; Sex Fairness; *Social Bias; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Title IX Education Amendments 1972

ABSTRACT

This workshop session is designed to assist educators responsible for the implementation of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and the attainment of sex equity in postsecondary settings. Topics addressed by these materials include the following: (1) assessing the extent of sexism; (2) the legal context of Title IX; and (3) the social-educational context of Title IX. Workshop participants are encouraged to focus on their own personal awareness of sex discrimination and the extent to which it exists in their educational setting as well as to begin setting goals for nonsexist educational practices. Additionally, a comprehensive, step-by-step outline and participant worksheets are provided as aids for workshop facilitators. (Author/HLM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED104326

IMPLEMENTING TITLE IX AND ATTAINING SEX EQUITY: A WORKSHOP PACKAGE FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATORS

Shirley McCune and Martha Matthews, Coeditors

THE CONTEXT OF TITLE IX

Martha Matthews and Shirley McCune, Authors

Outlines and Participants' Materials for Generic Session One

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Harmatuck

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared for the
Title IX Equity Workshops Project
of the Council of Chief State School Officers

By the
Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education
National Foundation for the Improvement of Education

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Joseph Califano, Secretary
Mary F. Berry, Assistant Secretary for Education

Office of Education

Ernest L. Boyer, Commissioner

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED

No person in the United States, shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving Federal assistance.

This publication was prepared for the Council of Chief State School Officers by the Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education. It was prepared under contract #300-76-0456 for the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, under the auspices of the Women's Educational Equity Act. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view stated, do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Preface

This session outline comprises one component of a multicomponent workshop package developed by the Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education under a subcontract with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). This package, entitled Implementing Title IX and Attaining Sex Equity: A Workshop Package for Postsecondary Educators, is designed for use by persons implementing training or staff development efforts for education personnel and interested citizens in the implementation of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and the attainment of sex equity in institutions of postsecondary education.

The workshop package was field-tested by subcontractors in eight regional workshops as part of the CCSSO Title IX Equity Workshops Project. This project was funded under contract 300-76-0456 with the Women's Program Staff, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Funds to support the printing of participant materials used in the field-test workshops were provided by the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Shirley McCune and Martha Matthews are the coeditors of the Workshop Package. This session outline was developed by Martha Matthews and Shirley McCune; Martha Matthews' time was partially supported by funds from the Ford Foundation.

Persons who have authored or contributed to other outlines and materials within the total package include: Janice Birk (University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland); Myra Sadker and David Sadker (American University, Washington, D.C.); Emily Taylor, Donna Shavlik, and Judy Touchton (American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.); Linda Stebbins and Nancy L. Ames (Abt Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts); Paul Lauter (State University of New York at Old Westbury); John Westerhoff (Duke University, Durham, North Carolina); Celeste Ulrich and Pearl Berlin (University of North Carolina, Greensboro, North Carolina); Dorothy McKnight, Margarite Arrighi, and Joan Hult (Athletic and Sport Consultants, Inc., Washington, D.C.); and Joyce Kaser and Kent Boesdorfer (Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education).

The CCSSO, the Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education, and the coeditors of the package gratefully acknowledge the assistance and advice of M. Patricia Goins, Project Monitor, Women's Program Staff, U.S. Office of Education, and Joan Duval, Director, Women's Program Staff, in the implementation of the contract. Grateful acknowledgement is also given to Sarita G. Schotta, Senior Research Associate, National Institute of Education for monitoring the contract which provided funds for the editing and printing of the field-test materials. Special gratitude is extended to the personnel of the 8 organizations who field-tested the Package in regional workshops for their efforts, their patience, and their support throughout the implementation of the Title IX Equity Workshops Project. These organizations and the project contact person in each include:

HEW Region	Organization	Contact
III	Women's Equity Action League 610 Glenn Road State College, Pennsylvania 16801	Norma Raffel
IV	University of South Florida FAO 295, USF Tampa, Florida 33620	Ellen Kimmel
V	University Council for Education Administration 29 West Woodruff Avenue Columbus, Ohio 43210	Grace Chisolm
VI	Dallas Independent School District 3700 Ross Avenue Dallas, Texas 75204	Frances Allen
VII	University of Kansas 220 Strong Hall Lawrence, Kansas 66045	Caryl K. Smith
VIII	Education Commission of the States 1860 Lincoln Street Denver, Colorado 80295	Jean Kennedy
IX	Arizona State University Tempe, Arizona 85281	Susanne Shafer
X	Northwest Projects Office for Educational Service Portland State University P.O. Box 751 Portland, Oregon 97207	Kathryn Preecs

The coeditors also wish to express their appreciation to Byron Hansford, Executive Director, Council of Chief State School Officers; William Israel, Director of Special Projects, Council of Chief State School Officers; and James Becker, Executive Director, National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, for their support of the project. Ann Baucom and Lois Jamieson of the CCSSO and Ann Samuel of the Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education receive special thanks for their tireless efforts in the production of materials for the Workshop Package.

September 1978

IMPLEMENTING TITLE IX AND ATTAINING SEX EQUITY:
THE CONTEXT OF TITLE IX

Contents

INTRODUCTORY MATERIAL

An Introduction to the Workshop Package I-1

How to Use These Materials I-9

SESSION OUTLINE - THE CONTEXT OF TITLE IX

Session specifications i

Session Agenda v

I. OPENING COMMENTS 1

II. IDENTIFYING AND ALLEVIATING SEXISM IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION--AN INTRODUCTORY ASSESSMENT 5

III. THE LEGAL CONTEXT OF TITLE IX--EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS AND FEDERAL ANTIDISCRIMINATION REQUIREMENTS 9

IV. BREAK 16

V. THE SOCIAL/EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT OF TITLE IX 17

VI. SUMMARY AND CLOSING 40

PARTICIPANT MATERIALS

(Participant Worksheets A through 3)

THE CONTEXT OF TITLE IX

Introductory Materials

Prepared for the
Title IX Equity Workshops Project
of the Council of Chief State School Officers

By the
Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education
National Foundation for the Improvement of Education

IMPLEMENTING TITLE IX AND ATTAINING SEX EQUITY: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE WORKSHOP PACKAGE

Introduction

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the Federal law which prohibits sex discrimination against the students and employees of education agencies and institutions receiving Federal financial assistance, was enacted in June 1972; the regulation to implement the legislation, which defines the specific criteria against which nondiscrimination is to be assessed in the various policies and practices of education agencies and institutions, was issued in June 1975 and became effective in July of that year. Despite the passage of years, however, full compliance with Title IX is far from a reality in most agencies and institutions throughout the country, and equity for females and males in education has yet to be attained.

Although significant progress has been made in a number of schools and school systems--the basic required Title IX compliance procedures have been implemented, students and employees describe their "increased awareness" of the problems of sex stereotyping and sex discrimination, and concrete improvements are apparent with regard to equalization of athletic budgets for female and male sports or to integration of previously sex-segregated courses--in most cases, considerable change remains to be made if full compliance and sex equity are to be integrated and reflected throughout the policies, programs, and practices of an education agency or institution.

If the necessary change is to occur, educators must move beyond paper compliance and problem awareness in order to develop the skills and competencies required for problem solution. Educators, like all other human beings, need support and direction if they are to translate legislative or administrative mandates for change into the actual delivery of nondiscriminatory and sex equitable services.

Many methods may be used to support educators in the change process--written information may be distributed, consultation may be made available, briefings or meetings may be conducted, training programs may be implemented, demonstration programs may be undertaken, and evaluation and reinforcement systems may be installed. The needs and resources of a particular education agency or institution will determine the forms of support which are most appropriate. One of the most frequently used methods of supporting change by education personnel is the inservice training workshop. In many situations, the inservice workshop is a cost-efficient way of reaching large numbers of personnel in a single effort and of providing assistance in skills development to these personnel. Implementing Title IX and Attaining Sex Equity: A Workshop Package has been designed to support the implementation of such a workshop.

The Development of the Workshop Package

Implementing Title IX and Attaining Sex Equity: A Workshop Package was developed by the Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education for the Council of Chief State School Officers' Title IX Equity Workshops Project during 1977 and 1978. The Title IX Equity Workshops Project was funded

under an 18-month contract for "National Regional Dissemination Workshops and Development of Technical Assistance Materials for Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments" by the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under funds authorized by the Women's Educational Equity Act.

The purpose of the project was to develop and field test a training package which could assist education personnel and interested citizens to gain:

- an understanding of the manifestations and the effects of sex discrimination and sex bias in education
- an understanding of the requirements of Title IX and its implementing regulation, and of the steps required to achieve compliance
- skills and capability for the development and implementation of policies, programs, and management systems to ensure educational equity

The terms of the contract required that the package developed must be suitable for:

- use with groups representing all levels of education from elementary through postsecondary
- use at the local, state, regional, and national levels
- use without extensive reliance on consultative assistance or on materials outside the package itself

In order to address these requirements, it was decided that the training package must be developed according to the following considerations:

- Because of the differing needs, experiences, and frames of reference of elementary-secondary educators and postsecondary educatiors, "the" training package would need to be two training packages--one for elementary-secondary educators and one for postsecondary educators.
- Because the training package needed to be suitable for use with a wide variety of groups, it would need to include a wide variety of information and activities ranging from "awareness level" to more advanced skills-development and action-planning levels.
- Because the training package needed to be suitable for use by personnel without extensive background in training or consultation and materials resources, it would need to provide specific step-by-step instructions for the implementation of training as well as all materials which would be required for the implementation of training.

All of these considerations are reflected in the form and content of the Workshop Package as it is now published.

Initial plans and specifications for the Package were reviewed by more than 90 leaders in education in March 1977. These leaders were asked to evaluate the plans and suggest modifications in light of:

- their assessment of the training and technical assistance needs of education institutions and agencies related to the attainment of Title IX compliance and sex equity
- their evaluation of strategies available for meeting identified training and technical assistance needs
- their knowledge of resources which would facilitate the development and dissemination of the Workshop Package

Working drafts of the Package materials were field tested and evaluated in 19 workshops implemented by subcontractors in the various HEW regions. Eleven workshops for elementary-secondary educators and eight workshops for postsecondary educators were implemented from September 1977 through January 1978. During the field test workshops, the Package was evaluated by workshop facilitators, workshop participants, and on-site evaluators. Final copy of the Workshop Package was completed after analysis of all of the evaluations obtained during the field test workshops.

An Overview of the Workshop Package

Both the Workshop Package for Elementary-Secondary Educators and the Workshop Package for Postsecondary Educators provide training session outlines and participant's materials for a fifteen-hour workshop sequence on Title IX and sex equity in education. Each package is organized according to five three-hour workshop sessions. Three of these sessions are termed "Generic Sessions"; they are designed to provide general information and experiences which are relevant to all participants attending the workshop. The other two sessions, called "Application Sessions," are designed to provide specialized information and experiences to persons of different professional roles and to enable participants to apply workshop experiences to their individual professional responsibilities. Each of the components of the Workshop Package corresponds to one three-hour workshop session; a component includes both a detailed step-by-step session outline for facilitators and the materials designed for participant use during the workshop sessions.

The sequence (and titles) of the workshop sessions for elementary-secondary educators is outlined below; there is a written component in the Workshop Package for Elementary-Secondary Educators which corresponds to (and bears the same title as) each of these workshop sessions.

Generic Session One: "The Context of Title IX"

Generic Session Two: "The Title IX Regulation and Grievance Process"

Application Sessions A and B: Two sequential application sessions focus on the responsibilities and roles of six different groups with regard to Title IX compliance and the attainment of sex equity in education. Application sessions focus on the following roles and responsibilities:

- The Administrator's Role

  Session A - "Ensuring Procedural Title IX Compliance: Establishing a Foundation for Sex Equity"

  Session B - "Monitoring Title IX Implementation"

- The Teacher's Role

  Session A - "Identifying and Overcoming Sex Bias in Classroom Management"

  Session B - "Identifying and Overcoming Bias in Instructional Materials"

- The Counselor's Role

  Session A - "Identifying and Overcoming Bias in Counseling and Counseling Programs"

  Session B - "Identifying and Overcoming Bias in Counseling Materials"

- The Vocational Educator's Role

  Session A - "Overcoming Sex Discrimination and Attaining Sex Equity in Vocational Education: The Social/ Educational and Legal Context"

  Session B - "Overcoming Sex Discrimination and Attaining Sex Equity in Vocational Education: Recognizing and Combating Sex Bias and Planning for Action"

- The Physical Activity Specialist's Role

  Session A - "Achieving Sex Equity in Physical Education and Athletics: Legal Requirements and the Need for Change"

  Session B - "Achieving Sex Equity in Physical Education and Athletics: Analyzing and Planning for Action"

- The Community's Role

  Session A - "Building a Knowledge Base for Change"

  Session B - "Building Skills for Change"

Generic Session Three: "Planning for Change"

The objectives for Generic Session One include:

- to provide participants with an opportunity to assess their awareness of differential treatment of males and females in their schools and the impact of Title IX

- to provide participants with a review of the legal context of Title IX, an overview of Federal antidiscrimination laws, and the opportunity to assess their skills in identifying discrimination in schools

- to provide participants with an understanding of differential sex-role socialization as it is manifested in schools

- to encourage participants to identify goals for nonsexist education

The objectives for Generic Session Two include:

- to review with participants the requirements of the regulation to implement Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972

- to provide participants an opportunity to assess their own understandings of Title IX requirements by sharing questions and answers with others

- to provide participants with an understanding of the significance of Title IX grievance procedures as a method for resolving complaints of sex discrimination and for monitoring Title IX compliance

- to provide participants with information regarding the structural components or characteristics of an effective grievance procedure and an opportunity to evaluate the structure of several sample grievance procedures

- to increase participants' understanding of and skills related to their own potential responsibilities for grievance problem solving

- to provide participants an opportunity to increase their skills in identifying Title IX violations and in formulating corrective or remedial actions appropriate to these violations through the analysis of sample Title IX grievances

The objectives for Generic Session Three include:

- to provide participants with an overview of some of the necessary conditions for change related to Title IX and sex equity in education and of the types of strategies available for planning and implementing change efforts in these areas

- to provide participants with a framework for diagnosing organizational change needs related to Title IX and sex equity and for designing action strategies which would be appropriate for meeting these needs

- to provide participants with an opportunity to develop preliminary plans for organizational change which could contribute to the full implementation of Title IX and achieving sex equity in their districts

- to increase participants' skills in developing action programs related to Title IX and sex equity for implementation in their own job functioning

Although the specific objectives of the Application Sessions vary according to the group for which the session is designed, all Application Sessions are generally designed to provide participants with the opportunity to:

- identify the implications of Title IX for their own job functions
- increase their skills for identifying and alleviating sex discrimination and for providing sex equity in their own job functions
- consider actions which can be taken in their own job functions to ensure Title IX compliance and increase sex equity in their education agencies and institutions

Although the content of the Package for Postsecondary Educators has been designed to address the unique needs of personnel of postsecondary education institutions, its organization and sequence parallel those of the Package for Elementary-Secondary Educators. The three Generic Sessions, although different in content, are the same in title and objectives as those for elementary-secondary educators. Application Sessions for postsecondary educators include: The Administrator's Role, The Counselor's Role, and The Teacher Educator's Role. (Application Sessions for faculty, for student services personnel, and for physical activity personnel have been developed in draft form and may be published in the future.)

Materials which supplement the basic components of the Workshop Package are also available. Two Participant's Notebooks, one for elementary-secondary educators and one for postsecondary educators, have been developed. These Notebooks contain all the worksheets used by participants during the three Generic Sessions; they also include substantial reference material which highlights or expands the content presented in these sessions, and an annotated listing of resources relating to Title IX and the achievement of sex equity in education. (Although the Generic Sessions may be implemented using only the participant's materials included with the session outlines, the reference material and resource listing included in the Participant's Notebooks make the use of these notebooks desirable wherever possible.)

A Final Context for the Workshop Package

Three major assumptions underlie the total Workshop Package, assumptions which should be kept in mind during its use:

- Title IX is one part of a total educational equity movement.

  Title IX is an evolutionary step in our nation's efforts to provide equity for all citizens. Our experience with years of attempting to eliminate race discrimination and bias in education provided the foundation for our understandings of sex discrimination and for the strategies and technology which may be used in its elimination.

  Anyone working to attain educational equity must remember the multiple ways that equity may be denied--on the basis of race; national origin; religion; cultural identity; sex; mental, emotional, or physical handicap; and social class--and work to ensure that the needs of all students are provided for.

- Our nation's concern for educational equity is a reflection of changes in our society; the achievement of educational equity is a crucial step in ensuring the survival of a viable society.

Our nation's concern for human and civil rights of various groups is rooted in the evolution of our society as it is affected by widespread social, economic, and technological change. Schools have the responsibility for preparing all students to participate in and to deal with these changes. Failure to achieve educational equity limits the potential attainments of our future society. Educational equity is not just a moral goal; it is a survival goal.

- The movement for educational equity is an important vehicle for educational reform.

Educators can be proud of the many accomplishments of our educational system. Despite these accomplishments, however, the changing nature of our society demands that we move on to greater achievement. Efforts to attain educational equity can contribute to implementation of many of the basic educational reforms which are needed. The greater individualization of instruction, the preparation of students for a variety of life roles, and the involvement of students in learning how to learn--these reforms are possible within the context of educational equity.

It is hoped that the Workshop Package and materials will assist its users in actualizing these assumptions and providing greater equity and higher quality education for all students.

HOW TO USE THESE MATERIALS

The following materials are one component of the multicomponent workshop package Implementing Title IX and Attaining Sex Equity. They provide resources and a step-by-step guide for implementing one three-hour workshop session, which is one session within the fifteen-hour workshop sequence outlined in the total Workshop Package.

The material in this session outline may be used in several ways:

- as the design and supporting material for a three-hour session which is presented as part of a 15-hour (two and one-half day) workshop on Implementing Title IX and Attaining Sex Equity
- as the design and supporting material for one of a series of five three-hour sessions utilizing the Workshop Package as a basis for a sequence of periodic seminars on Title IX and sex equity for education and/or community personnel
- as stimulus material for the adaptation and design of other activities or materials which can assist education personnel in achieving sex equity (e.g., information packets, self-instructional materials, etc.)
- as resources for teacher education programs
- as resources for training-of-trainers programs

Implementing Title IX and Attaining Sex Equity: A Workshop Package has been developed to facilitate its implementation by personnel with limited experience in workshop implementation and/or the subject matter which is relevant to consideration of sex equity. It is beyond the scope of this publication, however, to provide the background information on workshop design, implementation, and evaluation which would otherwise be desirable. Education personnel reviewing the package or considering use of any package component may nonetheless find it useful to review the following questions which should be considered with regard to use of this or any other training design.

1. Is the workshop session design appropriate for the purposes of groups for which it may be implemented?

The Workshop Package has been developed to address the needs of education personnel with a diversity of experience and familiarity with regard to Title IX and sex equity. The workshop package sequence begins with a consideration of the need and rationale for Title IX; it moves through a detailed review of the Title IX regulation and the Title IX grievance process; it proceeds to an examination of the application of the Title IX regulation and sex equity principles to the particular day-to-day job functions of various groups of education personnel; and it concludes with an overview of the change process and an opportunity for participant action planning related to Title IX compliance and the achievement of sex equity.

Workshop planners and training personnel should carefully review both the general objectives of each workshop session and the purposes of specific session activities (both are listed in the session outlines) in order to ensure their relevance and appropriateness to the particular needs of their intended workshop target group.

Similarly, workshop planners should also review the training methodology suggested in the outline for its suitability for situational needs. The processes or methods used in conducting any workshop should be selected for:

- their appropriateness to workshop objectives
- their appropriateness to the styles and skills of available workshop facilitators
- their provision of sufficient diversity to accommodate different participant learning styles

Because the objectives of the workshop package emphasize the delivery of cognitive information, it relies heavily on the use of lecturette and question-answer processes. The skills required of workshop session facilitators for the presentation of these activities are also less specialized than those which are required for the presentation of more affectively oriented activities.

All session outlines also involve the use of personal inventory and skills testing or skills practice activities performed by participants individually, as well as small group discussions and action-planning activities. These are included in order to:

- provide participants an opportunity to practice relevant skills and to receive immediate feedback
- provide participants an opportunity to share reactions and to develop small support groups
- accommodate the needs of participants for experiential learning activities
- increase the informality and variety of workshop activities

These procedures or methods suggested in the training design may be adapted to reflect a different emphasis in objectives or to reflect the different styles or skills of workshop session personnel. In considering the procedures or methods used in any workshop, it is useful to evaluate whether:

A) they provide a mixture of affective, cognitive, and experiential activities sufficient to accommodate the diversity of participants learning styles

B) they follow a logical progression from awareness building, to problem exploration, to skills assessment or development, through stimulation of the application of workshop information by participants in their relevant personal or professional activities

2. How much flexibility is desirable in implementing a session outline?

The session outline is intended as a guideline for the implementation of a training experience, not as a prescription that must be followed without deviation. The activities and sequence outlined in this session have been field-tested successfully with a variety of groups, but it should be recognized that no single design is appropriate for all situations. Facilitators should use the outline to assist them in meeting the needs of participants rather than as a constraint to necessary flexibility.

Flexibility is critical with regard to observance of the suggested timelines which have been provided in the session outline. These timelines tend to be highly concentrated. It will require most facilitators and groups to move at a brisk pace if all of the activities are to be completed in the time allowed. (Most of the sessions could benefit from an expansion of time allocated to each activity.) The timelines are general suggestions only; some groups of participants may need to spend more time on a single activity than is indicated in the outline and may be able to omit another activity, while others may find it impossible to move through the entire sequence of activities in the time available. The facilitator(s) must be sufficiently familiar with the training design and activities to determine the modifications which may be appropriate to a particular situation or group.

The primary guideline which should be observed in the implementation of the training activities is that care should be taken to meet the needs of the majority of the participant group. Facilitators should avoid modifications which may address the needs of only a few participants and attempt to meet the needs of individuals during break periods or after the workshop without detaining the entire group.

3. How can the workshop activities and sequence be adapted to fit shorter periods of time?

Although the session outlines were designed for implementation in three-hour periods, it is recognized that it may be necessary to modify the session for implementation in a shorter period of time. When this is necessary, the facilitator(s) should review the objectives of each suggested activity carefully before making a decision about which activities would be most appropriate. If this modification is necessary the facilitator(s) should consider the following:

A) Carefully review the sequence and the build-up activities provided in the session outline. Each session outline has been developed to include each of the following components:

- Needs assessment activity/exercise--Session outlines begin with an introductory activity which can involve the group in the session, allow individuals to express personal concerns and provide the facilitator with general information about the perceptions and experience of the group. This initial experience is a key method of judging the specific needs of the group and estimating the optimal pacing of the session activities.

- Cognitive activities--Each session outline includes a lecturette(s) to introduce new concepts and activities. These are designed to increase participants' understanding of particular problems related to sex equity and of the steps to be taken and the principles to be followed in achieving sex equity. The amount of information provided in a lecturette can be reduced if the group has had previous exposure to the concepts being presented. Even with experienced groups, however, it is useful to provide a summary of the key points included in the lecturette to ensure that all members of the group have a common frame of reference for subsequent activities.

- Experiential activities--Experiential activities provide an opportunity for participants to apply the concepts presented in cognitive activities to situations in educational practice. The purpose of this activity is to help participants assess for themselves the implications of the information presented for day-to-day activities.

- Skills practice activities--Each session outline includes a number of activities which are designed to give participants an opportunity to practice some of the skills which are necessary for the application of sex equity principles and to obtain immediate feedback regarding their efforts.

- Action-planning activities--Each session outline encourages participants to begin to identify specific steps which they or their education agency can take to promote full implementation of Title IX and/or to attain sex equity in their activities. These action-planning steps are crucial to the application of the information provided in the workshop package. They should not be eliminated and in fact, wherever possible, it would be desirable to expand the amount of time devoted to action planning. This is particularly relevant when participants work together in the same education agency.

In most cases, it is desirable to reduce the amount of time devoted to each of the various types of activities provided rather than to omit any of the major components of the session outline.

B) Provide participants with reading materials prior to the workshop session.

If the workshop time is limited, it may be possible to reduce the amount of time devoted to the workshop activities by providing participants with materials which can be read prior to the implementation of the workshop. If the facilitator believes that this is desirable, a summary of the information provided in lecturette or information sheet form may be distributed to participants prior to the workshop.

C) Reduce the amount of time spend on exercises and worksheets.

One way that the timelines for the session can be cut is to ask participants to consider only a limited number of cases or situations

presented in their worksheets, suggesting that others be completed some time after the workshop. (If this is done, the facilitator should make certain to explore those items selected for use in the group in sufficient detail to clarify for participants the basic principles reflected in the worksheet.) In all instances, the facilitator should emphasize ways which the participant materials may be used after the workshop.

4. What personnel are needed for the implementation of the session outline?

Although this session outline has been developed to facilitate its use by personnel of varying backgrounds, the selection of personnel to facilitate workshop activities is a critical factor in the implementation of any session. While the session outline may be implemented by a single facilitator, it is desirable to utilize a team of two or more facilitators. Use of a team has the following advantages:

- it increases the likelihood of ensuring both content expertise (knowledge of Title IX and sex equity principles in education, of the structure of education agencies, or Federal and state nondiscrimination laws, etc.) and process expertise (knowledge of group dynamics and skills in group processing and training) in the delivery of the session outline
- it makes it possible to demonstrate nondiscrimination by use of a training team on which both females and males and members of racial and ethnic minority groups are represented
- it makes it possible to increase the diversity of training styles and areas of expertise, and thus to accommodate the diverse learning styles and needs of workshop participants

If a facilitator team is utilized, it is important to designate one or two persons with responsibility for providing continuity and direction throughout all workshop activities. Persons with responsibility for workshop administration and for such tasks as participant registration, distribution of materials, and general problem solving should also be designated, particularly when the workshop involves a large number of people.

5. How should facilitators prepare for the implementation of the workshop session?

Effective implementation of the training session requires careful facilitator preparation. Facilitators should take ample time to do the following:

- thoroughly review the session outline and all participant materials
- prepare notecards outlining the sequence and the general directions for participants
- prepare their own outlines of the suggested lecturettes so that they may present the information provided in their own style (in no case should a facilitator read from the session outline during session implementation)

- identify points where information or activities could be omitted in the event that more time is needed in an earlier activity

If a team of facilitators is used, it is essential that the group meet together to:

- assign various responsibilities to the team members, making sure that each individual is clear about her/his role in appearing before the group, monitoring individual and small group work, preparing charts or materials, and working with other team members
- designate one person as the person responsible for providing continuity throughout the workshop and making decisions as to necessary adaptation of timelines
- discuss individual reactions to activities and ways that adaptations might be made if necessary
- consider the various styles represented in members of the team and the ways that the team might work together for maximum effectiveness

6. How should participants be involved in the workshop initially?

Considerations regarding the involvement of participants in the workshop event usually revolve around two issues: whether workshop participation should be voluntary or mandatory, and to what extent participants should be involved in the workshop planning process.

Determination of whether workshop participation should be voluntary or mandatory should be made in consideration of the workshop objectives, the job requirements of various staff groups, and other situational variables which may be relevant. The training design may be appropriately used whether participation is voluntary or mandatory. It is important to remember, however, that whether participants are notified of the obligation to attend or invited to participate, a clear and positive statement of workshop sponsorship, workshop purposes and objectives, and the time and location of the workshop can do much to establish a positive climate for the workshop and to alleviate uncertainties or anxieties experienced by participants. It is also important that participants are notified or invited in sufficient time to allow for personal planning or scheduling and for clarification of any questions regarding participation. It may also be useful to provide short preparatory reading material which can raise interest in or establish an initial context for the workshop.

Another method of establishing a positive workshop climate is to involve participants (or representatives of the workshop target groups) in workshop planning activities. This might be done through simple written or oral needs assessments which serve both to provide information about the felt needs of participants and to introduce participants to basic workshop issues. It might also be accomplished by simply keeping key participants informed of various stages of planning or decisionmaking, or by requesting the assistance of selected participants in obtaining workshop facilities, reproducing resource materials, introducing resource persons, etc.

The training design specifies no procedures for participant involvement prior to workshop implementation; workshop personnel should select procedures which are appropriate to the size, structure, and climate of their particular agencies or institutions.

7. What participant materials are needed to implement the session?

All materials which are required for participant use during a workshop session are attached to the session outline; these may be reproduced for distribution to session participants. Although the participant materials for each session are fairly extensive (and thus require some financial expenditure to reproduce in quantity), they are important to the successful implementation of the session because:

- they provide quick reference information for participants with little prior background
- they support and highlight the information provided by facilitators and allow participants to be actively involved in the training process
- they permit individual problem assessment and skills testing by participants related to session concerns
- they reinforce participants' workshop session experiences and provide participants a document for continuing on-the-job reference or use

(It should be noted that although all required participant materials are attached to the corresponding session outlines, a more comprehensive Participant Notebook has been developed and published as one component of the Workshop Package. This notebook includes not only all worksheets used during the three Generic Sessions, but also additional reference material and an extensive annotated listing of resources related to Title IX and sex equity. Ideally, each participant should receive a copy of this full Participant's Notebook and a copy of all worksheets for the Application Sessions which are appropriate to their role--e.g., adminstrator, counselor, etc.

8. What facilities, equipment, and resources are needed for implementation of the workshop?

The physical facilities provided for a workshop can make a significant difference in the difficulty or ease of its implementation. The workshop package requires a room sufficiently large to accommodate all participants for the generic sessions and small break-out rooms for each of the application group sessions provided. Moveable tables and chairs facilitate the creation of an informal environment and the implementation of small group activity. Attention should be given to ensuring that facilities are well lighted, at a comfortable temperature and well ventilated, and within access of rest-rooms. It is desirable to inspect facilities well in advance of the workshop to ensure that they will meet the needs of the workshop.

The equipment to be utilized in the session is specified in the training outline. Care should be taken to make arrangements well in advance of the workshops for the use of equipment to check just prior to the session to ensure that the equipment is available and in working order.

9. What guidelines should be observed by facilitators throughout the workshop?

Workshops dealing with sex equity often involve participants in a questioning of some of their earliest learnings and most basic beliefs and assumptions. Individuals dealing with these issues may have negative feelings about changing roles of males and females in our society and experience fear or anger about sex equity efforts in education. It is critical that workshop facilitators understand that these reactions are to be expected and how to handle them in positive ways. Some suggestions for dealing with possible resistance or rejection of the ideas covered in the workshop are outlined below.

Workshop facilitators should:

- Remember that change in knowledge, attitudes, and skills requires time and continued support. Each person must move through a process of exploring, understanding, and acting on new ideas before they can be accepted. Rejection of ideas presented in the workshop should not be interpreted as a personal rejection of the presenter.

- Work to provide continuing support to participants even when they are met by disagreement and/or resistance. Responses to be avoided by workshop personnel include:

  - Defensiveness--the expression through words or behaviors that a facilitator or resource person feels as if an attack has been made against her/his personal ability or adequacy. Workshop personnel should try to maintain an open attitude and deal with the ideas presented by the participant rather than the internal feelings that these ideas may create.

  - Rejection of the group--the categorization of an individual or group as "hopeless." One of the ways that facilitators may deal with persons who disagree is to reject them. It is important that workshop leaders maintain communications with all participants and continue to work through the feelings and ideas presented.

  - Future predictions--statements to an individual or the group such as "I'm sure you'll eventually see it my way." Although it is quite likely that many who reject ideas presented in workshops will change over a period of time, it is not helpful to dismiss the issues being considered by making future predictions.

  - Avoidance of the issues--dropping relevant controversial issues before they have been considered. Avoiding open consideration of possible implications of the Title IX regulation through a comment such as "There's really no need for major changes in most programs" does not contribute to participant learning or problem solving. Workshop facilitators should anticipate some of the controversial questions or concerns which are likely to be raised and be prepared to deal with them, if only by admitting uncertainty and a willingness to help participants obtain assistance from other sources.

- Overcontrol of the participant group--pressing the group ahead regardless of their present needs or ability to deal with some of the issues. Overscheduling a workshop agenda so that time is not available for clarification questions or for consideration of the implications of the information in small group discussion is one way to overcontrol the participant group. Workshop plans must include time to ensure that participants have the opportunity for initial exploration and evaluation of the information presented.

- Work to maintain a climate where participants' questions, feelings, and opinions can be expressed and considered. Maintain a nonjudmental approach toward the expression of feelings or opinions which differ from those being expressed in the workshop.

- Provide participants with concrete information and materials whenever possible. Much of the resistance to accepting change occurs when people do not understand the rationale for change and the specific steps that must be taken in implementing change. It is essential that participants be given opportunity to identify specific directions for change, to develop the necessary skills for change, and to receive support and assistance during this process.

THE CONTEXT OF TITLE IX

Session Outline

Prepared for the
Title IX Equity Workshops Project
of the Council of Chief State School Officers

By the
Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education
National Foundation for the Improvement of Education

THE CONTEXT OF TITLE IX

GENERIC SESSION ONE

Session Specifications

Session population: Postsecondary education personnel, including administrators, Title IX coordinators, faculty, counselors, student services personnel, teacher education faculty, and physical education and athletics staff, and members of boards of trustees.

Session objectives: The objectives for Generic Session One include:

- to provide participants with an opportunity to assess their awareness of differential treatment of males and females in their education institutions and the impact of Title IX on such treatment
- to provide participants with a review of the legal context of Title IX, an overview of Federal antidiscrimination requirements, and the opportunity to assess their skills in identifying discrimination in postsecondary education institutions
- to provide participants with a review of the differential participation of females and males in postsecondary education and some of the factors and barriers affecting women's participation
- to encourage participants to identify characteristics and goals for nonsexist postsecondary education

Time required: Three hours

Materials needed:

For participant use:*

- "Implementing Title IX and Attaining Sex Equity: A Workshop Overview" (included in participant materials as Participant Worksheet A; appears in participant notebook as "Implementing Title IX and Attaining Sex Equity: An Introduction to the Workshop")
- "Implementing Title IX and Attaining Sex Equity--An Introductory Assessment" (included in participant notebook--Participant Worksheet 1)
- "Identifying Discrimination--Case Examples" (included in participant notebook--Participant Worksheet 2)

* The participant materials attached to this session outline include all worksheets required for participant use during this session; they may be reproduced for distribution to participants. A Participant's Notebook, which contains not only the worksheets for all three generic sessions, but also reference materials which highlight and expand workshop content, has also been developed and may be obtained for reproduction. Use of this Notebook is desirable whenever possible.

- "Nonsexist Institutions--How Would They Look?" (included in participant notebook--Participant Worksheet 3)

- "Identifying Discrimination--Analyses of Case Examples" (included in participant notebook--Appendix A)

For facilitator use:

- Charts on newsprint, acetate, or chalkboard:

  - "Summary of Federal Antidiscrimination Requirements" (see section III of this session outline)

  - "Women as Percentage of All ..." (two charts; see section V of this session outline)

  - "Institutional Barriers to Women in Postsecondary Education" (see section V of this session outline)

Facilitators required: Although the session may be conducted by a single person, it is preferable in most cases to share responsibilities among several persons (female and male) who possess both subject matter expertise and group process skills, and who represent racial-ethnic diversity

Facilitator preparation required: The facilitator(s) should:

- thoroughly review this outline and all participant materials

- review suggested lecturettes and adapt lecturettes to accommodate unique group needs or facilitator(s) style(s)

  - Opening Comments (see section I of this session outline) 20 minutes

  - Introductory remarks (see section II of this session outline) 2 minutes

  - "The Legal Context of Title IX--Education Institutions and Federal Antidiscrimination Requirements" (see section III of this session outline) 10 minutes

  - "Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education" (see section V of this session outline) 10 minutes

  - "Factors and Barriers Affecting Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education" (see section V of this session outline) 20 minutes

- prepare charts (on newsprint, acetate transparency, or chalkboard) as identified in "Materials needed" listing of these Session Specifications

Group size: Flexible

Facilities required: Meeting room to accommodate expected number of participants; moveable tables and chairs will facilitate small group work

Equipment and supplies required: Overhead projector and transparencies, chalkboard and chalk, or newsprint and marker; pencils for each participant

THE CONTEXT OF TITLE IX

GENERIC SESSION ONE

Session Agenda

I.	OPENING COMMENTS	TIME REQUIRED:	20 MINUTES
II.	IDENTIFYING AND ALLEVIATING SEXISM IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION--AN INTRODUCTORY ASSESSMENT	TIME REQUIRED:	30 MINUTES
	A. Introductory remarks	(2 minutes)	
	B. Individual activity--"An Introductory Assessment"	(5 minutes)	
	C. Paired discussions	(13 minutes)	
	D. Total group processing	(10 minutes)	
III.	THE LEGAL CONTEXT OF TITLE IX--EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS AND FEDERAL ANTIDISCRIMINATION REQUIREMENTS	TIME REQUIRED:	55 MINUTES
	A. Lecturette--"The Legal Context of Title IX"	(10 minutes)	
	B. Individual activity--"Identifying Discrimination--Case Examples"	(10 minutes)	
	C. Small group discussions	(20 minutes)	
	D. Total group processing	(15 minutes)	
IV.	BREAK	TIME REQUIRED:	10 MINUTES
V.	THE SOCIAL/EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT OF TITLE IX	TIME REQUIRED:	60 MINUTES
	A. Lecturette 1--"Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education"	(10 minutes)	
	B. Questions and answers	(5 minutes)	
	C. Lecturette 2--"Factors and Barriers Affecting Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education"	(20 minutes)	
	D. Small group discussions--"Nonsexist Institutions--How Would They Look?"	(15 minutes)	
	E. Total group processing	(10 minutes)	
VI.	SUMMARY AND CLOSING	TIME REQUIRED:	5 MINUTES
		TOTAL TIME REQUIRED:	180 MINUTES

I. OPENING COMMENTS TIME REQUIRED: 20 MINUTES

Purposes of the activity:

The purposes of this activity are:

- to provide participants with an overview of the workshop purposes, the workshop objectives, and the workshop agenda
- to introduce to participants the groups or organization implementing the regional workshop, the workshop leaders, and other key individuals
- to provide participants with an introduction to the CCSSO project, an indication of the relationship of the regional workshop to the total project, and a review of the role of the regional workshop participants in the national project efforts
- to introduce participants to the participant notebook and to its uses during and after the workshop

Materials needed:

For participant use:

- "Implementing Title IX and Attaining Sex Equity: A Workshop Overview" (in participant materials--Participant Worksheet A) or "Implementing Title IX and Attaining Sex Equity in Education--An Introduction to the Workshop" (in participant notebook)

For facilitator use: None

Facilitator preparation needed:

The facilitator should:

- thoroughly review the total session outline and participant materials
- prepare opening comments

Procedure:

The purpose of this activity is to provide workshop participants with an overview of the purposes of the workshop, the organization of the workshop session, and the objectives of this session.

The session may begin with introductions and greetings; any necessary housekeeping announcements--restroom locations, scheduling of refreshments, availability of materials, etc--should be covered at this time.

The opening comments may take any form or sequence which is appropriate to the particular workshop, but the facilitator should make certain that the following points are covered:

- the importance of Title IX implementation and the attainment of sex equity to the quality of the postsecondary education institutions represented by participants

- the general purposes of the workshop

- the sponsorship of the workshop (and the sponsor's past or present experiences related to sex equity in postsecondary education)

- the workshop agenda, objectives, and activities--overview of the five sessions

- the purposes and uses of the participant materials, notebook

Some opening comments of the type which may be useful are suggested below: these should be adapted as appropriate to particular situations.

"This workshop is being conducted by (name of sponsor) as part of a nationwide effort directed toward the implementation of Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments and the attainment of sex equity in education. It is based on a training model developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers under funds provided by the U.S. Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The materials we will be using in the workshop were developed by the Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education for the CCSSO."

(At this point, the facilitator may wish to describe the interest of the sponsoring organization in the workshop, and to outline the organization's past experience in and/or commitments to efforts to achieve equity in education.)

"This workshop has been designed to assist each of you in working to implement Title IX and to attain sex equity in education. Because the workshop is based on a training model which has been designed to provide assistance to a wide variety of persons with a wide variety of experiences and needs, you will experience a number of different activities and you will be provided a wide range of information. Workshop activities will begin with some of the most basic information and awareness activities related to Title IX and sex equity concerns, and then move to increasingly specific areas of information and skills-building activity. We hope that each of you will obtain information and skills which are new to you, and that you will take the opportunity to assist others in areas familiar to you.

"The workshop will be organized in five three-hour sessions. These sessions will be of two types:

Generic Sessions which are designed to provide information and activities useful to anyone working to implement Title IX and to attain sex equity; these sessions will be attended by all participants together

Application Sessions which are designed to provide information and activities which are specifically relevant to the following groups of participants--

- *Administrators, Title IX Coordinators, and members of boards of trustees*
- *Counselors*
- *Teacher education faculty*

Each participant will select the group which is closest to her/his role or interest and attend two sequential Application Sessions in this group."

(Facilitators should note that the role groups listed above are those for which session outlines currently exist in the Workshop Package. Groups sponsoring the workshop may wish to develop their own sessions for faculty, for physical education/athletics staff, for student services personnel, or others. Material for these groups may be added to the Package in the future. The University Council for Education Administration - 29 West Woodruff Avenue, Columbus, Ohio - is also publishing training materials on sex equity which may be used with postsecondary educators.)

"The first two workshop sessions will be Generic Sessions. They will focus on such areas as the legal context of Title IX, the educational/social context of Title IX, the requirements of Title IX as specified in its implementing regulation, and the Title IX grievance procedure. The third and fourth sessions will be Application Sessions which will focus on activities unique to the various participant job roles. The fifth and concluding session will be a Generic Session; it will provide an opportunity to plan action steps and programs which may be taken in postsecondary education institutions to apply the workshop learnings."

(Facilitators should review the workshop agenda here, calling attention to any special presentations planned or to any other unique aspects of the particular workshop being implemented.)

"Before we discuss the objectives and activities of this first workshop session, we would like to call your attention to the participant materials which have been provided."

(At this point the group facilitator should make reference to the participant materials used in the workshop. If only the "Participant Materials" which appear at the end of this outline are used, comment should be limited to the fact that the participants will find in these materials an overview of the workshop agenda and objectives as well as an agenda and the worksheets which will be used in the Generic Sessions. If the full Participant's Notebook is used, reference should also be made to the value of its use as a reference material during and after the workshop.)

Before proceeding further, the facilitator may wish to stop to respond to any general questions which participants may have regarding the overall workshop plan or format. After responding to any questions raised, she/he should review with the group the objectives for the first Generic Session.

II. IDENTIFYING AND ALLEVIATING SEXISM IN EDUCATION--AN INTRODUCTORY ASSESSMENT — TIME REQUIRED: 30 MINUTES

(A) Introductory remarks (2 minutes)
(B) Individual activity--"An Introductory Assessment" (5 minutes)
(C) Paired discussions (13 minutes)
(D) Total group processing (10 minutes)

Purpose of the activity:

The purposes of this activity are:

- to assess participants' awareness of the manifestations of sexism and sex differentiation within the policies, programs, and practices of the education institutions in which they work
- to identify participants' perceptions of the past and potential contributions of Title IX to the elimination of sexism and sex differentiation in these policies, programs, and practices
- to establish workshop norms for active individual involvement and group sharing
- to establish a norm for the application of workshop concerns and information to personal and institutional self-evaluation and change

Materials needed:

For participant use:

- "Implementing Title IX and Attaining Sex Equity--An Introductory Assessment" (in participant notebook--Participant Worksheet 1)

For facilitator use: None

Facilitator preparation required:

The facilitator(s) should:

- thoroughly review the total session outline and all participant materials
- review suggested introductory comments and adapt them to fit unique group needs and facilitator style

Procedure:

A. Introductory comments (2 minutes)

The activity should be introduced with comments such as the following:

"Most of us come to this workshop with different perceptions, ideas, or experiences relating to Title IX and to the general issue of sex discrimination in postsecondary education. Before we discuss specific Title IX provisions and compliance activities, it is useful for us to spend a few minutes examining our own ideas and experiences relating to sexism in postsecondary education, and to share some of them with others

in the group. Identifying our own experiences provides each of us with a valuable base from which to consider Title IX requirements.

"Each of you has in your materials a sheet entitled, 'Implementing Title IX and Attaining Sex Equity--An Introductory Assessment. Please take a few minutes to answer the questions listed; write your answer in the space provided under each question. You should answer the questions based on your experience in your job or on your observations of your institution. Please be as specific as you can in answering all four questions. You will have about five minutes. Please work independently; you will have a chance to discuss your responses in a few minutes."

B. Individual activity--"An Introductory Assessment" (5 minutes)

The facilitator should make sure all participants have found a copy of the assessment form (Participant Worksheet 1) in their materials, ask if there are any questions, and make sure that all participants have a pencil or pen. She/he should also provide any clarifying instructions which may be appropriate. Participants should be allowed approximately five minutes to answer the questions on the worksheet.

C. Paired discussions (13 minutes)

When most participants have completed their answers, the facilitator should ask them to pair with a person sitting near them whom they do not know, to introduce themselves, and to discuss their answers. Approximately 13 minutes should be provided for this discussion.

D. Total group processing (10 minutes)

After the participants have had an opportunity to discuss their answers in pairs, it is useful to have them share some of their answers in the total group. Allow approximately 10 minutes for this activity.

Group processing may be initiated by saying simply, *"All right, we'll take a few minutes now to discuss the kinds of answers we've produced."* The worksheet questions can then be discussed one at a time. If discussion is slow, it is usually possible to stimulate participation by asking for reactions to suggestions made by the facilitator.

For example, if participants are hesitant to volunteer answers to question #1, the workshop facilitator might ask, *"How many of you notice differences in the kinds of positions occupied by men and women within your institutions?"* As hands are shown, the facilitator may then ask, *"What kinds of differences are they?"* These stimulus questions might refer to sex differentiation in institutional regulations, the content of the curriculum, treatment of male and female students by faculty members, counseling and counseling tests and materials, physical education, athletics, financial assistance, honors and awards, and many others. (These issues are discussed in greater detail in part C of section V of this outline.)

With regard to the second question, participants may provide information on Title IX-related activities undertaken by their institutions or on personal activities related to sex equity. This question is deliberately open ended; all such responses are appropriate.

In discussing or "processing" the third question, workshop facilitators should assist participants both in the identification of specific Title IX compliance efforts and in the assessment of the general impact of these efforts. If participants are slow to respond, it may be useful for the workshop facilitator to ask participants about their awareness of required Title IX compliance procedures--whether they have received a notification of compliance policy; whether they know the name of the employee responsible for coordinating Title IX compliance efforts; whether they are familiar with the internal grievance procedure for processing Title IX complaints (the focus of an activity later in the workshop); or whether they are aware of the existence and results of the institution's self-evaluation of Title IX compliance and what they believe its effects have been.

The fourth question is also open ended; appropriate responses may vary greatly. Some may focus on such subjective and general factors as improved attitudes; others may identify such concrete and specific measures as the purchase of nonbiased counseling materials or the modification of athletics programs.

The workshop facilitator should also encourage participants to look at their assessment forms as they proceed through other activities. She/he should point out that the answers to these questions can provide a valuable base for Title IX compliance efforts and for both personal and institutional action planning; they provide data against which the Title IX requirements to be discussed later in the workshop may be compared.

III. THE LEGAL CONTEXT OF TITLE IX--EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS AND FEDERAL ANTIDISCRIMINATION REQUIREMENTS — TIME REQUIRED: 55 MINUTES

(A) Lecturette--"The Legal Context of Title IX" (10 minutes)
(B) Individual activity--"Identifying Discrimination--Case Examples" (10 minutes)
(C) Small group discussions (20 minutes)
(D) Total group processing (15 minutes)

Purpose of the activity:

The purposes of the activity are:

- to provide an overview of the range of Federal antidiscrimination requirements affecting postsecondary education institutions
- to provide participants a legal context for considering Title IX as it relates to other Federal antidiscrimination requirements
- to review Federal laws prohibiting racial and ethnic discrimination in education and to reinforce efforts for their implementation
- to provide participants an opportunity to assess their skills in the recognition of illegal discrimination in education policies, programs, and practices and in the identification of Federal requirements which apply to various discriminatory situations in postsecondary education

Materials needed:

For participant use:

- "Identifying Discrimination--Case Examples" (included in participant notebook--Participant Worksheet 2)
- "Identifying Discrimination--Analyses of Case Examples" (included in participant notebook--Appendix A)

For facilitator use:

- A chart (on newsprint, acetate transparency, or chalkboard) containing the following information:

Summary of Federal Antidiscrimination Requirements

Requirement	Prohibits	Covers
Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964	Race discrimination	Students
Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964	Race and sex discrimination	Employees
The Equal Pay Act of 1963	Sex discrimination (in pay only)	Employees
Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972	Sex discrimination	Employees and students

Requirement	Prohibits	Covers
Title VII and VIII of the Public Health Service Act	Sex discrimination	Specified employees and applicants for admission
Executive Order 11245	Race and sex discrimination	Employees

Facilitator preparation required:

The facilitator(s) should:

- thoroughly review the total session outline and participant materials
- review suggested lecturette and adapt it to accommodate unique group needs and facilitator style
- prepare chart on "Summary of Federal Antidiscrimination Requirements"

Procedure:

A. Lecturette--"The Legal Context of Title IX" (10 minutes)

The purpose of this activity is to provide participants with an overview of Federal antidiscrimination requirements and their relationship to education institutions and Title IX. Before beginning the lecturette for this session, the facilitator should make sure that the chart entitled, "Summary of Federal Antidiscrimination Requirements" is available for display and reference at the appropriate time during the lecturette.

"In the opening assessment activity, we focused generally on issues relating to sex differentiation and sex equity in postsecondary education and on issues related to the progress made and the problems remaining in Title IX implementations. In most of the activities throughout the workshop, we will be dealing very specifically with Title IX requirements for nondiscrimination on the basis of sex and with their implications for our institutional and individual programs and behaviors.

"Before we move to an indepth consideration of Title IX, however, it is important that we review other Federal antidiscrimination requirements relevant to education institutions. Title IX is not an isolated requirement recently imposed on education institutions and soon to be forgotten. It is rather the most recent of a series of Federal statutes designed to increase equality of opportunity in education institutions. Since the 1954 Supreme Court decision regarding Brown v. The Board of Education, Federal and state legislatures, Federal and state executive bodies, the courts, our education systems, and the society at large have been involved in continuing efforts to identify and eliminate various forms of discrimination and to define better the nature of equal educational opportunity. Title IX is the result of our recent recognition of the fact that many education institutions discriminate against students and employees on the basis of sex. Earlier requirements were enacted to prohibit other forms of discrimination. It is important for several reasons that Title IX compliance efforts be considered in the context of these earlier requirements:

- It is important that our efforts toward the implementation of these other requirements be maintained.

- These requirements provide language and case law or legal precedent which influenced the Title IX legislation and its implementing regulation, and will continue to affect future judicial interpretation of Title IX.

- Familiarity with these other requirements will enable us to recognize when efforts and programs directed toward Title IX compliance may be used to address other forms of discrimination and when separate programs are required to address unique needs related to a particular form of discrimination.

"The five Federal antidiscrimination laws and the one executive order identified on the 'Summary' chart you see posted comprise the major antidiscrimination requirements which are relevant to postsecondary institutions.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination against students on the ground of race, color, or national origin in programs receiving Federal funds. Title VI and related case law prohibit discrimination on the basis of race in student admissions, student access to courses and programs, and student policies and their application. Any institution or agency receiving Federal funds is covered by Title VI. Most education activities of a recipient agency or institution are covered, including activities or programs not in direct receipt of Federal funds. It was the language of Title VI which provided the model for Title IX.

Procedures for the filing of possible complaints of racial or ethnic discrimination are provided under the legislation. Such complaints should be filed with:

- The Office for Civil Rights
  U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
  Washington, D.C. 20201

or

- a regional Office for Civil Rights
  U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex. All institutions or agencies with 15 or more employees--including state and local governments and labor organizations--are covered under the amended Act. Title VII prohibits discriminatory practices in all terms and conditions of employment, including:

- recruitment, selection, assignment, transfer, layoff, discharge, and recall

- opportunities for promotion
- inservice training or development opportunities
- wages and salaries
- sick leave time and pay
- vacation time and pay
- overtime work and pay
- medical, hospital, life, and accident insurance
- retirement plans and benefits
- other staff benefits

A substantial body of case law and legal precedent has been developed under Title VII; this provides many of our currently accepted standards for nondiscrimination in employment. Many of the provisions in the employment section of Title IX regulation are based on Title VII.

Complaints of employment practices which discriminate in violation of Title VII should be made to:

- The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
  2401 E Street, N. W.
  Washington, D. C. 20037

or

- a regional Office of the EEOC

In instances where state or local fair employment practices laws provide procedures for the handling of complaints of discrimination, the complaint may be referred to the state or local agency for a 60-day period of time. If the complaint is not resolved at this level, the EEOC assumes responsibility for investigation and conciliation. If this fails, the EEOC, the U. S. Attorney General, or the complainant may file suit.

The Equal Pay Act of 1963 as amended by the Education Amendments of 1972

The Equal Pay Act prohibits sex discrimination in salaries and most fringe benefits. All employees of education institutions and agencies, including those in professional, executive, and administrative positions, are covered by the Equal Pay Act.

The Act provides that a man and a woman working for the same employer under similar conditions in jobs requiring substantially equivalent skills, effort, and responsibility must be paid equally even when job titles and assignments are not identical. Interpretations of the Equal Pay Act will influence interpretation of such issues under Title IX, whose regulation contains language similar to that employed in the EPA.

Employers are required to maintain specified records relevant to the determination of possible violations of the law. Complaints may be filed with:

- The Employment Standards Administration
  Wage and Hour Division
  U. S. Department of Labor
  Washington, D. C. 20210

or

- a regional Office of the U. S. Department of Labor

The complaint process provided under the EPA is the simplest and most direct of all those mentioned in this review.

Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments

Title IX prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex against students and employees of education programs and activities receiving Federal funds. Nearly all elementary, secondary, and postsecondary institutions are covered under this legislation. The Title IX regulation prohibits sex discrimination in such areas as:

- admissions to vocational, graduate, professional, and public undergraduate schools
- student access to courses and programs
- counseling and guidance--tests, materials, and practices
- physical education and athletics
- vocational education and athletics
- student rules and policies
- treatment of married and/or pregnant students
- financial assistance
- student housing
- extracurricular activities
- employment in education institutions

The regulation covering Title IX requires education agencies and institutions to develop grievance procedures for the local handling of complaints of discrimination. This procedure may be used or complaints may be filed directly with:

- The Office for Civil Rights
  U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
  Washington, D. C. 20201

or

- a regional Office for Civil Rights
  U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Title VII (Section 799A) and Title VII (Section 845) of the Public Health Act as amended by the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act and the Nurse Training Amendments Act of 1971

Titles VII and VIII of the Public Health Service Act state that institutions receiving Federal funds for their health personnel training programs may not discriminate on the basis of sex in admissions or in employment practices relating to employees working directly with applicants or students. Every institution receiving or benefiting from a grant, loan guarantee, or interest subsidy to its health personnel training programs or receiving a contract under Titles VII or VIII is covered.

Institutions are required to maintain specified records to determine whether violations have occurred. Periodic reviews of programs receiving Federal funds may be made to determine compliance with the regulation covering Titles VII and VIII.

Procedures are provided for the filing of complaints of violations of Titles VII and VIII. Complaints may be filed with:

- The Office for Civil Rights
  U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
  Washington, D.C. 20201

or

- a regional Office for Civil Rights
  U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Executive Order 11246 as amended by 11375

Executive Order 11246 prohibits employment discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex in institutions or agencies with Federal contracts of over $10,000. Relevant contracts include both contracts for direct services and 'grants' which involve a benefit to the Federal government. Institutions covered under the Executive Order must observe nondiscriminatory practices in hiring, discharge, promotion, wages, benefits, training, and all other conditions of employment.

Those institutions or agencies with Federal contracts of $50,000 or more and 50 or more employees are required to develop written affirmative action plans with numerical goals and timetables. Although the contract may involve only one unit within the institution, the affirmative action plan must cover all employees throughout the institution.

Enforcement of the Executive Order and related policy guidelines is the responsibility of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC) of the U.S. Department of Labor. The OFCC has designated HEW as the agency responsible for enforcement of the Order as it affects education institutions and agencies. Complaint procedures are provided for the filing of charges of possible discrimination and noncompliance. Complaints should be filed with:

- The Office for Civil Rights
  U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
  Washington, D.C. 20201

or

- *a regional Office for Civil Rights*
  U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

B. Individual activity--"Identifying Discrimination--Case Examples" (10 minutes)

The facilitator should ask participants to take "Identifying Discrimination--Case Examples" (Participant Worksheet 2) from their materials. The activity may be introduced with comments such as:

"It is important that each of us knows not only the general provisions of these Federal requirements, but also how to apply them to the evaluation of discrimination in eduction policies, programs, and practices.

"Each of you should have in your materials a copy of Participant Worksheet 2, entitled 'Identifying Discrimination--Case Examples.' Please take a few moments to read each example. Consider each one and determine whether you believe it is in violation of any of the Federal antidiscrimination requirements just reviewed. You may want to refer to the 'Summary' chart which is posted in the room. Write the number of the Federal requirement(s) which you believe applies to each example in the space provided below it. You will have about 10 minutes to work individually."

C. Small group discussions (20 minutes)

After most participants appear to have completed their reviews, they should be instructed to form small groups of four or five persons and spend approximately 20 minutes discussing:

- the requirement(s) applicable to each example
- the critical factors indicating possible discrimination in each example

If it appears that participants may have difficulty completing the discussion during the time allotted, the facilitator may assign groups on one side of the room the odd numbered cases, and groups on the other side the even numbers.

D. Total group processing (15 minutes)

After the small group discussions have been completed, it is useful to spend approximately 15 minutes in review and clarification with the total group. The facilitator may ask members of the group to volunteer their comments on each of the examples. As each is discussed, it is important that the facilitator determine that the small groups have correctly identified the requirements relevant to each example. When differences of opinion or confusions are evident, it is important that the facilitator highlight the factors which are critical to the identification of the relevant Federal requirement. The facilitator may wish to refer to "Identifying Discrimination--Analyses of Case Examples" for clarifying information. Before terminating the discussion, the facilitator should point out that the "Analyses" are provided in Appendix A of the participant notebook for future reference by participants.

If time permits, it may also be useful to encourage participants to consider whether there are similarities between the case situations and situations which the participants have observed. If this be done, workshop facilitators or resource persons should restrict their comments to information regarding the possibility of discrimination and refrain from other evaluation.

The workshop facilitator should close this activity by reminding participants that work remains in the implementation of each of these requirements and that continuing efforts must be made to combat all forms of discrimination. As participants consider various perspectives and activities related to Title IX in the workshop sessions, they should attempt to identify similarities and differences between sex discrimination and racial-ethnic discrimination, and strategies or points for complementary action interventions.

IV. BREAK

TIME REQUIRED: 10 MINUTES

V. THE SOCIAL/EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT OF TITLE IX — TIME REQUIRED: 60 MINUTES

(A) Lecturette 1--"Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education (10 minutes)
(B) Questions and answers (5 minutes)
(C) Lecturette 2--"Factors and Barriers Affecting Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education" (20 minutes)
(D) Small group discussions--"Nonsexist Institutions--How Would They Look?" (15 minutes)
(E) Total group processing (10 minutes)

Purposes of the activity:

The purposes of the activity are:

- to provide participants with a conceptual/data base regarding the issues of sex bias and sex discrimination in postsecondary education, and a context for understanding the significance and rationale of the Title IX regulation:
  - to review data regarding the differential participation of females and males in postsecondary education as both students and employees
  - to review data regarding some of the major barriers to women's participation in postsecondary education
- to provide participants with an opportunity to identify some of the characteristics of postsecondary education institutions as they might exist if they were free of sex bias, in order that participants may better understand the significance and rationale of the Title IX regulation

Materials needed:

For participant use:

- "Nonsexist Institutions--How Would They Look?"--Participant Worksheet 3

For facilitator use:

- A chart (on newsprint, acetate transparency, or chalkboard) containing the following information:

Women as Percentage of All 1974

• High school graduates	50.6
• Bachelor's degree recipients	45.4
• Master's degree recipients	44.8
• Doctoral degree recipients	21.3
• First professional degree recipients	12.6

- A chart (on newsprint, acetate transparency, or chalkboard) containing the following information:

Women as Percentage of All 1975-1976

• Professors	9.1
• Associate Professors	16.6
• Assistant Professors	27.9
• Instructors	49.3
• Lecturers	41.2
• Faculty at All Ranks	21.7
• Administrators	16.0

- A chart (on newsprint, acetate transparecny, or chalkboard) containing the following information:

Variables Possibly Affecting Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education

Psychological

- intellectual ability
- aspiration level
- motivation to achieve
- role conflict

Social

- race
- socioeconomic background
- marital and parental status

- A chart (on newsprint, acetate transparency, or chalkboard) containing the following information:

Institutional Barriers to Women in Postsecondary Education

I. Institutional policies/practices re: student participation

- admissions
- financial aid
- student residence and enrollment

II. Student programs (or lack thereof)

- counseling services
- health services
- special services/programs
- athletics
- faculty attitudes

III. Bias in curriculum content, research, and the academic disciplines

IV. The status of women in postsecondary education employment

Facilitator preparation required:

The facilitator(s) should:

- thoroughly review this outline and all participant materials
- review suggested lecturettes and adapt them to accommodate unique group needs or facilitator style (Note: research data for these lecturettes were compiled in 1977; facilitators should update these data wherever possible.)
- prepare charts needed for activity
  - "Women as Percentage of All..." (two charts: one on students and one on employees)
  - "Variables Possibly Affecting Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education"
  - "Institutional Barriers to Women in Postsecondary Education"

Procedure:

A. Lecturette 1--"Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education" (10 minutes)

The purpose of this lecturette is to begin to provide participants with an overview of the social/educational context of Title IX. Data presented in the suggested lecturette are fairly extensive for the time allocated. Facilitators may find it useful to select for presentation those which are most relevant to the particular participants involved in the workshop if information about participant's roles and responsibilities is available in advance of the workshop.

Before beginning the lecturette, the facilitator should make sure that all charts are accessible for display; reference should be made to them at appropriate times during the lecturette.

Suggested lecturette:

"As we worked with the various Federal anticiscrimination requirements in the preceding exercise, we were exploring the relationship of Title IX

to other antidiscrimination requirements. These other antidiscrimination requirements and their related judicial precedents provide one important part of the legal context for understanding the roots and significance of Title IX and the rationale behind the provisions of its implementing regulation.

"Another important context for the consideration of Title IX is the social and educational context provided by some of the basic data we have regarding the differential participation of females and males in postsecondary education and the barriers to women's participation in postsecondary education. Data such as these were considered by the Congress during hearings prior to passage of Title IX; they are useful to postsecondary educators because they suggest some of the steps that can be taken to ensure Title IX compliance and attain greater sex equity in our postsecondary institutions.

"During the next few minutes we will review some data regarding the differential participation of females and males in postsecondary education, both as students and employees. We will be discussing a considerable amount of statistical information. You need not try to take note of every statistic; instead, look for the general patterns which these statistics suggest."

(Note: Much of the information used in lecturettes 1 and 2 is contained on pages 21-43 of the Participant's Notebook. If participants are using this full Notebook, facilitators may wish to refer them to these pages for the references used in these lecturettes.)

Females and Males as Students in Postsecondary Education

"In the United States, women are more apt than men to complete secondary school--in 1975, 1,594,270 women and 1,538,753 men graduated from high school.1/ Women, however, are less likely than men to continue their educations beyond the secondary school level. Women's enrollment in education programs decreases relative to men's as the educational levels of the programs increase. This is true both in postsecondary vocational/technical programs and in baccalaureate and graduate programs. In both types of programs, those women who do continue in more advanced programs are usually enrolled in traditionally "female" areas of study.

Women in postsecondary vocational/technical programs

"The most recent national data regarding female and male participation in vocational education programs (data for Fiscal Year 1975) do not distinguish between secondary and postsecondary programs. These data do, however, present a general picture of sex stereotyping in vocational education program enrollments, which suggest the patterns which seem to be characteristic of postsecondary vocational education programs. These data indicate that although females are 48.3 percent of all vocational education students, they are heavily concentrated in four program areas: consumer and homemaking (82 percent of the enrollment is female); occupational home economics (73 percent female); health (72 percent female); and office occupations (69 percent female). In

contrast, females are only 12.6 percent of all students in trades and industry; 10.7 percent of all students in technical programs; and 9.2 percent of all students in agriculture. The only area in which females and males are enrolled in proportions which approach their representation in the total vocational education enrollment is distribution, which has an enrollment which is 42.8 percent female. 2/ A comparison of these enrollment figures with those of 1972 indicates that there has been some tendency for both female and male students to move into those program areas which have traditionally been dominated by students of the opposite sex. It is important to note that this trend has been much more pronounced for males than for females; males are enrolling in traditional 'female' areas at a more rapid rate than females are in traditional 'male' areas. 3/

"Data regarding the degrees awarded to females and males in postsecondary occupational programs of one to four years in length reflect similar patterns of sex stereotyping. Women predominate the shorter duration programs and in those programs which provide preparation for traditional 'women's' occupations In 1974-75, women were 56.7 percent of all students receiving degrees in 1-2 year programs, but only 47.8 percent of students receiving degrees in 3-4 year programs. Further, women were the majority of the degree recipients in only two of the six major programs: health services technologies (women were 87.4 percent of all degree recipients) and business and commerce (women received 56.9 percent of all degrees awarded). Women received only 39.3 percent of all degrees awarded for public service related technologies; 36.1 percent of those awarded for data processing technologies; 29.9 percent of those awarded for natural sciences technologies; and 2.4 percent of those awarded for mechanical and engineering technologies. 4/

Women in baccaluareate and graduate programs

" Although women constituted 50.9 percent of all students graduating from high school in 1975, they were only 45.4 percent of all students enrolled in undergraduate degree programs in institutions of higher education in the fall of 1975. They were only 44.5 percent of all students enrolled in graduate programs, and 20.7 percent of all students enrolled in programs leading to the receipt of the first-professional degree (law, medicine, etc.). 5/

"Similarly, data regarding the advanced degrees awarded to women and men document the decreasing representation of women at progressive levels of higher education. In 1974, women earned 45.4 percent of all bachelor's degrees; 44.8 percent of all master's degrees; 21.3 percent of all doctoral degrees; and 12.6 percent of all first-professional degrees. Although a comparison of these percentages with those of 1969 indicates that the precentages of women receiving degress at all levels have increased, it is important to note that even the high rates of increase in the proportions of women receiving doctoral and first-professional degrees did not bring women into anything approaching parity with men. Although the percentage of women awarded first-professional degrees increased by 268 percent between 1969-70 and 1974-75, women only received 7,029 first-professional degrees, while men received 49,230. At the doctoral level, women received only 7,267 degrees, as compared to men's 26,819. 6/

"Analyses of these data according to the fields in which the degrees were awarded reveal further patterns of stereotyping. Although the percentage of women awarded degrees in several traditional 'male' fields has increased notably between 1964-65 amd 1974-75, widespread stereotyping in the major fields of study is still apparent. For example, the percentage of women receiving bachelor's degrees in computer and information science has risen from 4.6 percent in 1964-65 to 18.9 percent in 1974-75, while the percentage of women receiving bachelor's degrees in architecture has risen from 4.6 to 17.4 over this same period. 7/ Despite the existence of such notable increases in particular fields at each degree level, a review of the degrees awarded in each of the major fields of study at each degree level in 1974-75 indicates that stereotyping is still conspicuous. At the bachelor's level, women received over 50 percent of all degrees awarded in nine of the twenty-four fields: area studies, education, fine and applied arts, foreign languages, health professions, home economics, letters, and library science. At the master's level, women received over 50 percent of the degrees awarded in only six of the twenty-four fields: education, foreign languages, health professions, home economics, letters, and library science. At the doctoral level, women were awarded over 50 percent of the degrees in only one area: home economics. 8/

"In addition to such differences in the distribution of female and male students within various program levels and fields of study, there seem to be differences in the distribution of females and males within various types of education institutions. Recent research suggests that females enrolled in higher education programs tend to be enrolled at smaller, less selective, and less affluent institutions than male students. 9/ Several studies also indicate that the drop-out or attrition rates of women in higher education programs are higher than those of men. 10/

"In short, despite some recent progress, differences still remain in the participation of females and males as students in postsecondary education. Women are underrepresented as both students and employees in postsecondary education in general and the degree of their underrepresentation increases with progressive educational level. Women are disproportionately concentrated in a restricted number of 'female' fields, and disproportionately concentrated in less selective and less affluent institutions.

Females and Males as Employees in Postsecondary Education

Women as faculty members

"Numerous studies have documented the underutilization of women on higher education faculties. One of the most recent of these is the 1975-76 publication of the American Association of University Professors, Nearly Keeping Up: Report on the Economic Status of the Profession. 11/ According to this report, the total percentage of female faculty in the 1436 institutions sampled was 21.7; this total percentage represents a decline from the 1974-75 figure of 22.5. The distribution of females within the various faculty ranks is as follows:

	1974-75	1975-76
	%	%
Professor	10.1	9.1
Associate Professor	17.3	16.6
Assistant Professor	27.9	27.9
Instructor	48.0	49.3
Lecturer	41.4	41.2
All Ranks	22.5	21.7

The underutilization represented in these figures is apparent when a comparison is made of the 9.1 percent of full professors who are female with the 12.9 percent of all recipients of doctorates awarded between 1920 and 1973 who are female.

"The AAUP report not only indicates a decrease in the percentage of women employed on higher education faculties but also a decrease in the compensation of women faculty members relative to that of men. In 1974, the percentage difference between the average compensation of men and women faculty members of the same rank was 4.5; in 1975-76, this differential had increased to 5.2 percent.

"John A. Centra's study, Women, Men, and the Doctorate, 12/ provides further evidence of the underutilization of women on higher education faculties. Centra compared matched populations of male and female Ph.D.'s from the classes of 1950, 1960, and 1968 as to marital status, employment, publications, income, and attitudes. His findings indicate that of those employed in academic institutions more men than women are employed at universities, while more women than men work at two- and four-year colleges. More women are teaching, while more men are in administration and management. Men have higher academic rank, and more men are presidents, deans and department heads, In contrast, women with comparable years of experience are instructors, lecturers, and assistant professors, or hold research appointments without faculty status.

"Centra's findings also indicate that income is the area of greatest difference between men and women with doctorates. Men's incomes vary from an average of $18,700 for those with five to six years of experience to $27,100 for 22 to 23 years experience. For the same experience levels, women's average income is $16,400 and $21,800 respectively. Similar patterns exist in all disciplines, with the greatest disparity in the physical sciences, where the comparable figures are $17,800 to $29,100 for men and $14,700 to $21,300 for women.

"Findings similar to those of the AAUP and Centra reports have been published in many studies. Other data confirm that:

- Women are concentrated in the less prestigious education institutions: in the private 'research institutions' women constitute only 10.8 percent of the faculty, while in private two-year colleges women comprise 34.2 percent of the faculty. 13/

- The gap between the salaries of female and male faculty members increases with the prestige of the employing institutions. A 1975 estimate of the average gap between female and male faculty nationwide was $2,800; the comparable estimate for faculty employed at university centers was $3,800. 14/

- The percentage of women holding tenured faculty positions appears to be declining. In 1971-72, 17 percent of women faculty occupied tenured positions; in 1974-75 this figure was only 13 percent. 15/

It should be noted that despite Federal requirements for affirmative action, the status of women faculty within higher education institutions appears to be worsening.

Women as administrators

"The status of women within higher education administration is clearly apparent in Alexander Astin's finding that 19 out of 20 freshmen enter institutions in which all three key administrative posts (president, chief academic officer, and dean) are held by men. 16/

"A comprehensive study on Women and Minorities in Administration of Higher Education Institutions has recently been published by the College and University Personnel Association. 17/ 1,037 institutions of higher education provided data on 18.035 administrators employed during the 1975-76 academic year. Among the many findings of this study were that:

- *The large majority of people holding the 52 types of administrative positions studied were white men. White men held about 79 percent of the administrative positions at the survey institutions, white women held 14 percent, minority men held 5 percent, and minority women held under 2 percent.*

- *At all institutions, men dominated the chief executive positions, holding 96 percent of the posts at both white coeducational and minority institutions, 69 percent at white women's colleges, and 100 percent at white men's colleges.*

- *Women and minorities were generally best represented in positions relating to student affairs and external affairs.*

- *Job concentration was much greater by sex than by race. The job concentration of women (both white and minority) tended to be much greater than that of white men and somewhat greater than that of minority men.*

- *Women both white and minority, were paid only about 80 percent as much as men with the same job title when employed by the same type of institution.*

"In summary, it appears that patterns of female and male participation as students and employees of postsecondary institutions reflect a traditional societal sorting of females and males on the basis of sex. They reflect the traditional assumption that education and employment are of primary importance in the lives of males, but secondary to the importance of family for females. This assumption, and the programs which it has shaped, are no longer consistent with the needs of our society. Given the increasing numbers of women entering the paid work force, heading families, and seeking education, postsecondary institutions, like other institutions in our society, must reevaluate their programs and modify them as necessary to accommodate these realities. In just a moment we will briefly look at our programs and begin to identify areas where modifications may be necessary."

B. Questions and answers (5 minutes)

Before proceeding to the next activity the facilitator should allow about five minutes to answer any questions that participants may have at this point.

C. Lecturette 2--"Factors and Barriers Affecting Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education" (20 minutes)

The purpose of this lecturette is to conclude the overview of the social/educational context of Title IX which was begun in Lecturette 1. It focuses on factors and barriers which have been suggested to discourage full participation by women in postsecondary education and to maintain the sex-differentiated patterns described in the preceding lecturette. Although the research reviewed in the suggested lecturette focuses on these factors or barriers as they may affect female students, the facilitator should point out or discuss the ways in which similar factors or barriers may affect female employees.

The information outlined in the suggested lecturette is considerably more extensive than can be discussed in the 20 minutes allocated for this lecturette. It is included here for the use of facilitators, who should select among the information covered in order to best address the needs and concerns of a particular group of participants. In most cases, heaviest emphasis should be placed on the information regarding "Institutional Barriers to Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education" because these are the subject of Worksheet 3 and of the Title IX regulation, which is considered in Generic Session Two.

Information on the psychological and social factors may be useful to facilitators in responding to questions raised by participants; it is also included in the full Participant's Notebook. If participants have the full Notebook available, the facilitator may wish to refer them to pages 21-43, which contain material similar to that outlined in the suggested lecturette.

The facilitator should post and refer to the "Variables" and "Institutional Barriers" charts at appropriate points during the lecturette.

Suggested lecturette:

"If postsecondary education institutions are to provide programs which meet the needs of both females and males and which comply with Federal requirements for nondiscrimination on the basis of sex, it is important that the possible reasons for the sex-differentiated patterns we have just discussed and their implications for the operation of postsecondary education institutions be considered. A review of the literature in this area suggests that it is useful to examine two categories of factors: those which operate outside the structures and procedures of postsecondary education institutions--the psychological and social factors which may influence women's participation in postsecondary education--and those which relate to the structures and procedures of postsecondary education institutions themselves--the policies and practices of postsecondary education institutions which may act as barriers to women's participation. Each of these categories of factors will be discussed briefly in the next few minutes.

"In considering the information presented, it is important to keep in mind three qualifications:

- First, the research findings in many of these areas (particularly those related to psychological and social factors) are complex. The conclusions of researchers and disagreements among them often hinge upon subtle distinctions and analyses which are beyond the scope of this lecturette. The information will present major generalizations in each of the areas discussed, generalizations which reflect the major trends in the data but may not delineate all of the finer issues or points of disagreement. Persons interested in a more complete review should examine the report Barriers to Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education, written by Esther Westervelt and published by the National Center for Education Statistics. 18/

- Second, although for purposes of simplicity we will be talking about two categories of factors--the psychological/social and the institutional--the two categories are in fact interactive. The psychological/social factors and the institutional factors frequently operate reciprocally--they contribute to one another.

- Third, because research regarding women's participation in postsecondary education outside of higher education is sparse, most of the research cited here is pertinent to higher education. It is likely, however, that correlates to many of the institutional practices discussed may be identified in other postsecondary education programs.

Psychological and Social Variables Affecting Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education

"Attempts to delineate the kinds of factors external to the operation of postsecondary education institutions which affect women's participation in these institutions have generally focused on two types of variables: psychological variables--possible sex-linked patterns in intellectual development and ability, motivation, self-concept, personality, or social behavior which may influence women's participation in postsecondary education--and social variables--demographic variables such as race, socioeconomic status, or marital and family status which may affect such participation.

"Most analyses of the psychological factors which may affect women's participation in postsecondary education focus on four primary issues: intellectual abilities, aspriation levels, motivation to achieve, and role conflict.

Intellectual abilities

"One of the most obvious possible explanations for sex-differentiated patterns in participation in postsecondary education is that there are sex differences in basic intellectual abilities. Maccoby and Jacklin, in their review of the literature regarding basic psychological sex differences, conclude, however, that although some sex differences in intellectual ability exist, they are not of an order sufficient to explain the extent or degree of difference in education participation and achievement by females and males. Maccoby and Jacklin found that:

- males exceed females in mathematicl abiliiy, particularly in the ability of spatial-visualization (the ability to rotate mentally objects in space, which is fundamental to several areas of mathematical performance)

- females exceed males in verbal ability

- there is no difference between the sexes in basic cognitive processes (females and males are equally proficient at both simple and high-level learning and analytical tasks) 19/

Although these findings may be generally consistent with the enrollment patterns of females and males in such major fields as mathematics, letters, and foreign languages at the undergraduate level, they are clearly not adequate to explain women's decreasing participation at progressive levels of education and their increasing concentration in a few traditional fields of study at these progressive levels. Further, it is important to remember that the existence of these sex differences does not mean that these differences are innate or biologically determined. It is equally likely that these differences may arise from an interaction of sex-differentiated socialization and education experiences with some form of sex-linked predisposition. If this is the case, these sex differences may be both a 'cause' of sex differences in educational participation and a result of early sex differentiation in educational experiences.

"Finally, it is also important to note that sex differences in educational participation exist when basic ability levels are held constant. Research indicates that when the population of high ability students who do not go on to college is examined, between 70-90 percent of these students are female. 20/

Aspiration levels

"Numerous studies have documented the fact that females hold lower educational aspirations than do males. 21/ Despite the fact that recent years have seen the increasing percentages of females receiving degrees at all educational levels, data presented in The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1974 indicate that the educational aspirations of females still lag behind males'. Although one-half of the women, as opposed to one-third of the men, had an average grade of B+ or better in high school, women were still more liekly than men to say that they contemplated leaving school before obtaining a bachelor's degree (15 percent of the women made such a statement, as contrasted to 10 percent of the men) and less likely than men to say that they expected to study for a graduate or professional degree (55 percent of the men anticipated such study, while only 46 percent of the women had such expectations). 22/ Given the existence of such sex differences in educational aspirations, differences which cannot be explained by differences in prior academic success, the question then becomes why such differences exist. One of the answers often suggested concerns achievement motivation.

Motivation to achieve

"Research regarding achievement motivation in women has been the source of considerable discussion in recent years. Much of this discussion has been stiumlated by the research of Matina Horner, which suggested that women, particularly high-ability, high-achievement oriented women, possess a motive to avoid success (defined in most of the experimental situations as academic success) which is elicited in mixed-sex competitive situations 23/ If such a motive does exist, it may indeed influence women's participation in post-secondary education, but Horner's research and interpretation have been subjected to question by other investigators. These investigators make two primary points. First, the motive to avoid success has not been demonstrated to predict just such achievement-related behavior as applying to graduate school or professional school. 24/ Second, the motivational constructs on which the research was based were developed on the basis of male achievement behavior and thus may say very little about achievement motivation in women, other than that it seems to differ in some fashion from achievement motivation in men. 27/

Role conflict

"The concept of role conflict may prove to be a useful one in understanding possible influences on women's participation in postsecondary education. It may suggest some of the reasons for women's lower educational aspirations than males' in the face of comparable intellectual ability, and it may serve to explain why women in some situations may seem to display a motive to avoid success, at least when success is defined in terms of direct academic or career achievment. Simply put, role conflict is essentially the apparent conflict perceived by many women (and men) between the ideal feminine role and role of academic or career achiever.

"A study by Matthews and Tiedeman suggests that such role conflict may affect women's participation in postsecondary education. Matthews and Tiedeman found that the three most important influences on a woman's patterns of educational participation, aspiration, and achievement during adolescence and early adulthood were: perception of male response to the use of her intelligence, conflict over the acceptance of male dominance in occupational pursuits and the 'place' of women in the home, and the perception of conflict between the demands of family and work on the married career woman. 25/

"Research in this area is not definitive, however. At least one study found no differences between career-oriented women and noncareer-oreinted women in their perceptions of feminine roles, 26/ and there appears to be a wide range of variation among women regarding the extent to which they conceive themselve and their roles according to stereotypical 'feminine' attributes and the extent to which their conceptions of self are reflected in educational aspirations and attainment. 27/

"In short, although research similar to that cited above suggests a number of promising areas for further investigation regarding the influences of psychological factors on the participation of women in postsecondary education, research in these areas to date cannot offer adequate explanations regarding sex-differentiated patterns of educational participation. As Westervelt concluded,

'. . .there is as yet no generally accepted, organized body of knowledge about the psychology of women from which we might draw tenable generalizations about fundamental psychological factors associated with the various educational choices women make.' 28/

"In efforts to determine influences on women's participation in postsecondary education, researchers have also examined a number of social factors which may affect this participation. The factors which seem to be significant in influencing women's educational participation include race, socioeconomic status, and marital and family status.

Race

"Any consideration of the impact of race or ethnicity on women's participation in postsecondary education must begin with the acknowledgment that all racial-ethnic minority groups are underrepresented in higher education in proportion to their representation in the population as a whole. 29/ Beyond this general underrepresentation, the representation of minority persons in higher education, and minority females in particular, varies among particular racial-ethnic groups. Research findings in this area must be examined with some care, as there are many different ways of presenting and analyzing the data.

"One recent study, the American Council on Education's report on Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minority Students, 1973-74, concluded that:

- Among all minority bachelor's degree recipients, 53 percent were female and 47 percent were male.
- The minority group with the lowest proportion of women recipients was Native Americans; women received 37 percent of all bachelor's degrees awarded to Native Americans.
- The minority group with the highest proportion of women recipients was Black Americans; women received 57 percent of all bachelor's degrees awarded to Black Americans. (This percentage is substantially higher than that for the percent of all women awarded bachelor's degrees in 1973-74; this figure was 44 percent.)
- The percentages of Asian-American and Hispanic women receiving bachelor's degrees awarded to members of their racial-ethnic group paralleled the national figures on the percentages of bachelor's degrees awarded to all women students--all three groups of women earned approximately 45 percent of the bachelor's degrees awarded to the various groups. 30/

These figures are generally consistent with the common perception that Black women are proportionately overrepresented relative to both Black males and white females in higher education programs.

Another analysis of the participation of both Black and white females and males in higher education suggests a slightly different picture, however. When researchers compared the percentages of high school graduates of each group who continued in college between 1969-73, the following figures emerged:

- among white men, 40.2 percent of high school graduates attended college
- among Black men, 33.3 percent of high school graduates attended college
- among white women, 32.0 percent of high school graduates attended college
- among Black women, 26.0 percent of high school graduates attended college 31/

When the population of high school graduates is considered as the base for determining underrepresentation in higher education, Black women appear to face a double bind of denial based on race and sex.

"While reviewing these general statistical profiles, it may be useful to consider briefly what is known about possible racial-ethnic differences on the psychological variables identified earlier. Most of the research which exists on minority women focuses only on Black women, and the research which does exist frequently documents contradictory results. For example, two different studies on levels of educational aspirations in Black youth reach two different conclusions: one concludes that Black females have higher aspirations than Black males, 32/ while the other concludes the converse. 33/ While one study suggests that Black college women hold the same types of traditional female career goals as white women, 34/ another indicates that Black women, unlike many white women, tend to see working, rearing children, and fulfilling a career role as compatible. 35/ Although many of the particular interactions of racial-ethnic and psychological variables have yet to be fully understood, it is important to remember that historic differences among various groups of women have led to significant contemporary differences which may affect their participation in postsecondary education.

Socioeconomic status

"Socioeconomic status appears to affect females and males differently in relation to their participation in postsecondary education. Numerous studies have concluded that low socioeconomic status has a much more negative effect on the participation of females in postsecondary education than on the participation of males. They find that:

- Given two highly able students from low socioeconomic status, one female and one male, it is the male who is more likely to complete postsecondary training. 36/
- Of students from the top ability quartile and the lowest socioeconomic quartile, 25 percent of the males and 40 percent of the females fail to enter college. 37/
- Socioeconomic status is a more significant factor than intelligence in college plans, attendance, and graduation by women; the converse is true for men. 38/

In short, research appears conclusive that females from lower socioeconomic strata in our society are the persons who are least likely to participate in postsecondary education.

Marital and family status

"Like socioeconomic status, marital and family status appears to differentially affect participation by females and males in postsecondary education. Most research indicates that a woman's family responsibilities impose a constraint on her educational pursuits in a way which is not true for males. A review of research findings reveals that:

- Planning to marry while in college negatively affects women's degree aspirations. 39/

- In a nationwide sample of graduate students, married men appeared to be quite productive and the best adjusted of all graduate students. The most committed and active graduate students appeared to be divorced women. The investigator concluded that divorce becomes a force for liberation for women by removing a source of severe role conflict; for males, divorce becomes a source of strain because it removes from their lives a supportive relationship. 40/

- Participation rates in adult education were lower for mothers than for nonmothers but higher for fathers than for nonfathers. 41/ The presence of children in a family may serve to motivate men to pursue further education while imposing upon women responsibilities and time demands which interfere with educational activities.

"All of these social factors--race, socioeconomic status, and marital and family status--interact with one another and with the psychological variables identified earlier to influence women's participation in postsecondary education. While some of these factors may operate largely outside the control of postsecondary education institutions, many may be modified by or affected by modifications in the policies or practices of postsecondary education institutions. We will spend the next few minutes discussing some of these policies and practices.

Institutional Barriers to Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education

"There is little doubt that there are a variety of psychological and social factors which influence females' participation in postsecondary education, however imperfectly we understand these factors and their interaction at this time. Similarly, there is little doubt that postsecondary institutions, through many of their policies and practices, have functioned to deny or to discourage women's participation. Research suggests that many institutions of postsecondary education have maintained policies or practices which, on their face, discriminate against females. Still other policies or practices, although sex-neutral on their face, interact with the types of psychological and social factors previously identified to discourage women's entry and continuance in postsecondary education programs. Freeman has described this interaction in this way:

'An academic situation which neither encourages nor discourages students of either sex is inherently discriminatory against women

because it fails to take into account the differentiating external environment from which women and men students come.' 42/

A review of existing data indicates that the institutional factors which may discriminate against women or discourage their participation in postsecondary education are of four primary types:

- institutional policies and practices related to student participation (admissions, financial aid, etc.)
- student programs or services or the lack thereof (counseling, health services, etc.)
- the structure and content of curriculum, research, and academic disciplines
- the status of women in postsecondary education employment and the attitudes of faculty toward women students

"We will discussion each of these types of barriers briefly.

Institutional policies and practices related to student participation

"The policies and practices of postsecondary education institutions regarding student participation in their programs--policies and practices related to admissions, financial aid, student residency, time limits for enrollment and degree completion, etc.--often directly discriminate against or function to discourage the participation of women students.

"Admissions policies or practices -- Many of the traditional admissions policies of institutions of higher education have explicitly discriminated agsinst women applicants. Such policies include the establishment of different admissions criteria for women and men, the use of 'equal rejection rates' under which females and males are sorted into separate categories so that equal portions of each group may be accepted, or the maintenance of sex-based quotas or ideal male/female ratios which govern admissions. Because women as a group make better grades than do men at both high school and college levels, the use of quotas or equal rejection rates virtually ensures that the women admitted will be more qualified than the men and, in fact, that some of the women who may not be admitted are more qualified than some of the men who are. 43/ (The use of such quotas are in clear violation of the Title IX regulation requirements for admission. These will be discussed in greater detail in the next workshop session.)

"Such sexually discriminatory admissions policies may partially account for the already-mentioned fact that within the freshman class of 1974, almost one-half of the women and only one-third of the men had high school grade averages of B+ or better. Studies have similarly shown that female freshmen are more likely than males to have been high achievers in all types of extracurricular activities except science and athletics, 44/ and that 68 percent of the women admitted to graduate schools had undergraduate averages of B or better, as opposed to only 54 percent of the men admitted. 45/ (In evaluating the extent

to which discriminatory admissions policies contribute to such patterns, it should also be remembered that women at every educational level have lower aspirations than do men, and that they are therefore more likely to select themselves out of continued education. It is probable that such self-selection also contributes to the patterns documented.)

"In addition to such directly discriminatory policies as the maintenance of quotas or ratios for female/male acceptances there are a number of institutional policies which may function indirectly to discriminate against women. Because women are more likely than men to delay higher education, policies which place an age ceiling on students admitted are more likely to deny admission to women than to men. 46/ The refusal of institutions to accept transfer credits is also likely to negatively affect women who, more often than men, change geographic location in order to accommodate the education or career changes of their spouses. 47/ Similarly, the refusal of institutions to accept part-time students functions to discriminate against women who, more often than men, must assume responsibility for child care. 48/

"Financial aid practices--Research indicates that at both the national and institutional levels women are less likely than men to receive financial assistance in the form of scholarships, fellowships, and loans. 49/

- A national survey of 3,363 college sophomores found that in 1967, the average award of financial assistance to men was $1,001, while the average award to women was only $786. Student employment awarded as part of institutional financial aid packages paid men an average of $712 and women an average of $401. 50/

- According to 1970 testimony in Congressional hearings on discrimination against women, in 1969, women comprised 33 percent of the nation's graduate students but received only 28 percent of the graduate awards under NDEA, Title IV, and 29 percent under NDEA, Title VI. 51/

- Sex-restricted scholarships frequently limit the access of qualified women to financial aid. In one large and prestigious university, only 15 percent of all sex-restricted funds available in 1969 were restricted to women. 53/

- Women in college work-study programs generally work in lower paying jobs than men and receive less help from faculty in finding jobs relevant to their studies. In one institution, 30 percent of the women and 36 percent of the men received assistance from faculty members in locating their jobs, and 64 percent of the men and only 49 percent of the women found jobs relevant to their major fields. 54/

"There are also indications that women are discriminated against by financial aid practices which pertain to their marital and/or family status.

- In some institutions married women are routinely denied financial aid until all married men or unmarried students are covered. 55

- Despite the fact that child care expenses are significant for many women students, many financial assistance application forms provide no opportunity to list such expenses as costs incurred in pursuing education. 56/ (Although this policy affects both females and males, its impact on females is likely to be more severe because females typically receive smaller and fewer awards and are more likely than males to be responsible for children in case of separation or divorce.)

- In many institutions, financial aid is made available only to full-time students. (Again, although this policy formally applies to both females and males, it is females who are more likely to attend school part-time to accommodate family responsibilities.)

- Women who marry out-of-state residents may lose their eligibility for in-state tuition rates. Loss of such eligibility may drastically alter the costs incurred by women students. (In most cases, such policies are applied only to females.)

"Although some of these practices may have changed since issuance of the Title IX regulation (more recent data are not readily available), there is clearly a long history of discriminatory financial aid practices, a history which will require considerable effort to overcome.

"Other policies and regulations--Participation by married women in education programs is often discouraged by a variety of restrictive regulations established by postsecondary institutions. Time limits on eligibility for the receipt of degrees or diplomas may reduce the possibility of part-time study which is necessitated by the family responsibilities of many married women. Inflexible requirements related to housing (e.g., requiring all students to live in dormitories) or to course requirements (e.g., requiring all students to take physical education) may similarly deter participation by mature women.

"It is important to recognize that such policies and regulations function not only to limit the participation of women in higher education, but also the participation of many mature or nontraditional male students whose capacity for full-time study may be restricted by family or financial factors. Given the current organization of our society, however, such barriers tend to have a disproportionately negative impact on females.

Student programs or services (or the lack thereof)

"Women's participation in postsecondary education may be either facilitated or discouraged by the nature of programs provided in postsecondary education institutions. In some cases, women's participation may be discouraged by the direction of existing programs, in others by the lack of relevant programs.

"Counseling programs and services--In many postsecondary institutions the counseling services provided reflect and perpetuate sex discrimination and sex stereotyping against women students. For example:

- Pietrofesa and Schlossberg conducted a study of the recommendations made by 30 student counselors in a graduate counseling program when interviewing an upper-division undergraduate female subject with high mathematical ability who had been coached to manifest indecision as to whether she should major in mathematics or elementary education. Eighty percent of both female and male counselors counseled the student to major in elementary education. 57/

- Many of the interest inventories in use on many campuses have been shown to be sex biased. Birk has documented the existence of sex bias in the manuals of four interest inventories commonly used at the postsecondary level, 58/ while Tittle has pointed out that the empirical construction of the tests functions to ensure the maintenance of current sex-stereotyped occupational patterns. 59/

Because the body of counseling theory which shapes counseling and counseling tests and materials at this time has been developed largely on the basis of male career and achievement patterns, it is questionable whether most traditional counseling programs or services provided to women are in fact relevant to their needs and development 60/

"Health services--Health services frequently discriminate against women students by failing to make available any gynecological services. According to 1972 figures of the National Student Association, 53 percent of all college and university health services did not provide gynecological care, and 72 percent did not provide birth control services. 61/ The cost of obtaining such services can be significant for females, and the refusal of postsecondary education institutions to provide such services may function as a concrete indication to female students that education institutions are unsympathetic to their basic needs.

"Athletic programs--Vast differences between the athletic opportunities available for men and those available for women are conspicuous on most college and university campuses. Although significant change has occurred on a number of campuses in recent years (for example, the women's athletics budget at the University of California at Berkeley in the fall of 1977 was almost 90 times what it was five years ago, while the women's athletics budget at UCLA has almost tripled in the past three years), 62/ much progress remains to be made. A recent estimate of athletics budgets at the 'Big Ten' universities indicated that women's athletics budgets at these schools range from a low of 3.47 percent of the men's budget to a high of 11.11 percent. 63/

"Other programs and services--Several surveys of women students regarding the major factors which discourage their educational participation indicate that one critical factor is the absence of child care services on most campuses. 64/ The lack of such services, although affecting both females and males, seems to be by far more significant to women: according to a University of Chicago study, 33 percent of male students with children reported that their academic work was hampered by the need to care for children; for women with children, the figure was 77 percent. 65/

The structure and content of the curriculum, research, and the academic disciplines

"The policies, practices, and student programs of postsecondary education institutions often function to impose very concrete barriers to the participation of women in postsecondary education. A more subtle, but probably equally damaging, source of discouragement to female students lies in the structure and content of the curriculum, research, and academic disciplines which are the focal point of a student's postsecondary education experience. Generally, women find their experiences and contributions omitted from the curriculum, themselves excluded from research samples or their possible differences from males ignored in research designs, and the content of many of the major academic disciplines influenced by unexamined sexist assumptions. Paul Lauter has collected the following examples: 66/

- Until recently, much of the psychological research regarding achievement motivation was dominated by the constructs developed by David C. McClelland and articulated in his book, The Achieving Society. In the study on which this work is based, women were considered only as the mothers of the boys and men who were the achieving subjects--they were never considered as potential achievers in their own right.

- A leading art history textbook (The History of Art by Janson) does not mention a single woman artist in its text of over 500 pages; another volume (Hauser's The Social History of Art) acknowledges the existence of only one woman artist in a list of 450. (By contrast, Karen Petersen and J.J. Wilson, in their recent work on Women Artists discuss some 120 western women artists.) 67/

- In the 27 leading textbooks used in college-level American history survey courses (the textbooks which account for almost 99 percent of the market in this area), no more than two percent of the textual material in any one book is devoted to women, and in some volumes this percentage falls as low as .05. 68/

- The influence of sexist assumptions is apparent in many of the most basic formulations of the various social science disciplines--in anthropological theories which assume sex to be a 'universally necessary basis for role differentiation within a family'; 67/ in analyses of social stratification which fail to consider the unique experieces and circumstances of women within the male social universe; 68/ and in many psychological constructs derived from a male-centered Freudian psychology.

With such omissions of women, their contributions, and their unique experiences from the academic curriculum, women may well be led to believe that the academic world of scholarship and research offers them no place as participants.

The status of women in postsecondary education employment and the attitudes of faculty toward women students

"Although the status of women in postsecondary employment was reviewed earlier, it is important to consider the influence upon women students of the status of women as employees within postsecondary institutions. The presence of women as faculty members or administrators in an education institution provides female students with role models for their own participation; the absence of such role models deprives women students of an important source of reinforcement and validation which is available to male students. The significance of such role models on the achievement of women was demonstrated by a study performed by Elizabeth Tidball. Tidball sampled women from three successive editions of Who's Who in American Women and found a strong positive correlation between the number of women faculty on a campus and the number of women achievers graduating from that campus. 69/

"The attitudes demonstrated by faculty toward women students are another influence upon the participation of females in postsecondary education. Several reports indicate that female students perceive a lack of encouragement in the attitudes of faculty members. One report describes what it terms 'a climate of unexpectation' regarding female students; 70/ another cites faculty attitudes which discourage academic work by females, which imply that scholarship is unfeminine, which indicate an indifference to training females, and which manifest a reluctance to find females financial aid or academic jobs. 71/ In response to a national survey of graduate students conducted in 1969, 31 percent of the women responding indicated their belief that professors in the department did not take women seriously; the survey data suggested strongly that the rate and quality of student interaction with faculty consistently favored male graduate students. 72/ Although most of the data available in this area are subjective and anecdotal, they do call attention to one important influence on any student's participation in education programs, an influence which is potentially significant to both women and men.

"When all of these institutional barriers are considered together, it is clear that institutions of postsecondary education operate in many ways which function to discourage or to deny women opportunities for participation comparable to those available to males. (Indeed, the impression which emerges from reviews of data such as these is that institutions of postsecondary education are frequently functioning to discourage participation by most students who are not young, white, male, able to support their own educational participation, and able to devote full time to their education activities.) Differential admissions policies for females and males act to reinforce the lower educational aspirations of females. Differential financial aid policies reflect and embody the stereotypical notion that participation in postsecondary education is more important for males than for females. The failure at education institutions to permit part-time studies, to provide gynecological services, or to make provision for child care combine to increase the realistic role conflict experienced by many females who have chosen to marry or to have children. The relative absence of women from the curriculum and from the faculty and administration of education institutions denies women a view of their own potential roles in the education community. If equal participation by females and males in postsecondary education is to be attained and nondiscriminatory services are to be provided, programs must be developed to eliminate

institutional barriers such as these and to accommodate the different needs and experiences of both females and males of diverse racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds. In the next activity, we are going to consider how these programs might look. Are there any questions before we go on?"

D. Small group discussions--"Nonsexist Institutions--How Would They Look? (15 minutes)

The facilitator should begin the activity by asking participants to turn to Participant Worksheet 3 in their materials, which is entitled "Nonsexist Institutions--How Would They Look?" She/he may then introduce the activity with comments such as the following:

"For the next few minutes, we will be working in small groups to identify what institutions of postsecondary education might look like if they were free of sex bias. One way to begin thinking about the goals for improving postsecondary education for females and males (and thus, to think about the rationale for Title IX), is to try to envision what postsecondary education institutions would look like if they were free from bias. This third worksheet has been developed to help you to do this.

"On the 'Nonsexist Institutions' worksheet, you will see listed the institutional barriers to women's participation in postsecondary education that we reviewed. We would like you to spend about 15 minutes now working in small groups to list all the characteristics you can of each of the barriers as it would look if it were free from bias."

The facilitator should then ask participants to form groups of six persons each and to brainstorm ideas regarding each barrier. She/he should explain that in brainstorming, participants should come up with as many ideas as possible, without evaluating or rejecting any contribution. Tell participants that they will have approximately 15 minutes to complete the worksheet in their group. Suggest that although a group need complete only one worksheet, individual participants may find it useful to note the group responses on their own sheets for further reference.

E. Total group processing (10 minutes)

After the small groups have spent approximately 15 minutes in discussion, the facilitator should reconvene the total group for processing of the exercise. Approximately 10 minutes should be allowed for processing and summarizing. The leader may find it useful to ask such questions as:

- How easy was it for you to envision these barriers or areas as bias free?
- Which barrier or area did you find most interesting to think about, and what characteristics did you identify for it?
- Which was most difficult? Why? What characteristics did you list for it?

VI. SUMMARY AND CLOSING

TIME REQUIRED: 5 MINUTES

In order to summarize the session, the facilitator may wish to remind participants that the process that they went through in identifying characteristics of a nonsexist institution is similar to that which went into the development of the regulation to implement Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. She/he may suggest that implementation of the Title IX regulation is one important step in the attainment of nonsexist institutions which can encourage females and males to explore and utilize their abilities to the fullest.

She/he should conclude the session by reminding participants that Title IX requirements will be considered in detail in the second Generic Session and should then provide any housekeeping information relevant to the next generic session--its time, location, etc.

FOOTNOTES

1/ U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Education Statistics 1976 Edition, by W. Vance Grant and C. George Lind. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977), p. 66.

2/ U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, "Comparative Analysis of Vocational Education Enrollment by Sex in Fiscal Years 1972 and 1975," unpublished.

3/ Ibid.

4/ Digest of Education Statistics 1976 Edition, p. 128.

5/ Ibid., pp. 87 and 96.

6/ U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics, Earned Degrees Conferred 1974-75 Summary Data, by Curtis O. Baker and Agnes Q. Wells. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977), p. 3.

7/ Digest of Education Statistics 1976 Edition, p. 110.

8/ Earned Degrees Conferred 1974-75 Summary Data, p. 14.

9/ H. Astin, M. Harway, and P. McNamara, Sex Discrimination in Education: Access to Postsecondary Education (Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, 1976), p. 49.

10/ Anne C. Roark, "First-Time College Enrollment of Women Leaps Dramatically," The Chronicle of Higher Education XII (February 7, 1977): 10.

11/ American Association of University Professors, Nearly Keeping Up: Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 1976-77 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, 1976).

12/ John A. Centra, Women, Men and the Doctorate (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1974).

13/ Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Opportunities for Women in Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), p. 52.

14/ Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, Making Affirmative Action Work in Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975), p. 48.

15/ Marion Kilson, "The Status of Women in Higher Education," Signs I (Summer 1976), p. 937.

17/ Carol Van Alstyne et al., Women and Minorities in Administration of Higher Education Institutions (Washington, D.C.: College and University Personnel Association, 1977).

18/ U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics, Barriers to Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education, by Esther M. Westervelt. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977).

19/ Eleanor E. Maccoby and Carol N. Jacklin, The Psychology of Sex Differences (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1974).

20/ D.L. Pullen, "The Educational Establishment: Wasted Women," in Voices of the New Feminism, ed. M.L. Thompson (Boston: Beacon Press, 1970).

21/ Westervelt, p. 54.

22/ Digest of Education Statistics 1976 Edition, p. 89.

23/ Matina S. Horner, "The Motive to Avoid Success and Changing Aspirations of College Women," Women on Campus: 1970 (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1970).

24/ Maccoby and Jacklin.

25/ E.E. Matthews and David V. Tiedeman, "Attitudes Toward Career and Marriage and the Development of Life Style in Young Women," Journal of Counseling Psychology 11 (1964): 375-383.

26/ D. Morgan, "Perception of Role Conflicts and Self Concept Among Career and Non-Career Educated Women," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1962 as cited in Westervelt, p. 53.

27/ Westervelt, p. 54.

28/ Ibid., p. 49.

29/ Digest of Education Statistics 1976 Edition, p. 95.

30/ American Council on Education, Higher Education Panel Report No. 24, Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minority Students, 1974-75 as cited in On Campus With Women, November 1977. (Washington, D.C.: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.)

31/ Mary R. Carroll, David L. Clark, and Karen G. Beam, Women in Colleges and Universities (Indiana University and the University Council for Educational Administration, 1977), p. VII-2.

32/ Survey Research Services, A National Profile of Black Youth: Class of 1971 (Minneapolis, Minnesota: National Computer Systems, 1972).

33/ Astin, Harway, and McNamara, p. 90.

34/ P. Gurin and E. Epps, Black Consciousness, Identity and Achievement (New York: Wiley, 1975).

35/ P. Gurin and D. Katy, "Motivation and Aspiration in the Negro College" (Final report, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1973).

36/ Astin, Harway, and McNamara, p. 105.

37/ Ibid.

38/ W.H. Sewell, and V.P. Shah, "Socioeconomic Status, Intelligence, and the Attainment of Higher Education," Sociology of Education 40 (1967): 1-23.

39/ Astin, Harway, and McNamara, p. 155.

40/ S.D. Feldman, "Impediment or Stimulant? Marital Status and Graduate Education," American Journal of Sociology 78 (1973): 982-94.

41/ Westervelt, p. 42.

42/ Jo Freeman, "How to Discriminate Against Women Without Really Trying," unpublished paper, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, 1972.

43/ Westervelt, p. 8.

44/ The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1972 (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1972).

45/ J. Scott Hunter, The Academic and Financial Status of Graduate Students, Spring 1975 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967).

46/ Westervelt, p. 9.

47/ Ibid., p. 11.

48/ Ibid., p. 10.

49/ Ibid., p. 12.

50/ E.W. Haven and D.N. Horch, How College Students Finance Their Education (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1972).

51/ U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Education and Labor, Discrimination Against Women, hearings before a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, 1970.

52/ C.A. Myers, "Special Problems Encountered by Mature Women Undergraduates," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors 24 (1974): 137-139.

53/ U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Education and Labor, The Status of Women at Cornell, 1969 by Ella Kusnetz and Barbara Kusnetz, paper submitted to the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, 1970.

54/ University of Chicago, "Women in the University of Chicago," 1972, as cited in Westervelt, p. 17.

55/ Sheila Tobias, E. Kusnetz and D. Spitz, eds., Proceedings of the Cornell Conference on Women (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1969).

56/ Westervelt, p. 17.

57/ John Pietrofesa and Nancy K. Schlossberg, "Perspectives on Counselor Bias: Implications for Counselor Education," The Counseling Psychologist IV (1973).

58/ J.M. Birk, "Interest Inventories: A Mixed Blessing," Vocational Guidance Quarterly (June 1974): 280-86.

59/ Carol K. Tittle, Karen McCarthy, and Jane F. Steckler, Women and Educational Testing: A Selective Review of the Research Literature and Testing Practices (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1974).

60/ Samuel H. Osipow, "The Relevance of Theories of Career Development to Special Groups," in Career Behavior of Special Groups: Theory, Research, and Practice J. Steven Picon and Robert E. Campbell, ed. (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1975).

61/ Astin, Harway, and McNamara, p. 154.

62/ Candace L. Hogan, "From Here to Equality: Title IX," womenSports 4 (September 1977): 16f.

63/ Ibid.

64/ Westervelt, p. 29.

65/ University of Chicago.

66/ Paul Lauter, Implementing Title IX: Areas of Concern to College Faculty (Washington, D.C.: Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education, forthcoming).

67/ Alice S. Rossi, "Equality Between the Sexes: An Immodest Proposal," Daedalus 93 (1964): 607-652.

68/ Dorothy E. Smith, "Women's Perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology," Sociological Inquiry 44 (1): 7-13.

69/ M. Elizabeth Tidball, "Perspective on Academic Women and Affirmative Action," Educational Records (Spring 1973).

70/ Harvard University, Preliminary Report on the Status of Women at Harvard (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, March 1970).

71/ Report of the Subcommittee on the Status of Academic Women on the Berkeley Campus (Berkeley: University of California at Berkeley, 1970).

72/ Engin I. Holmstrom and Robert W. Holmstrom, "The Plight of the Woman Doctoral Student," American Educational Research Journal 11 (Winter 1974): 2.

THE CONTEXT OF TITLE IX

Participant Materials

Prepared for the
Title IX Equity Workshops Project
of the Council of Chief State School Officers

By the
Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education
National Foundation for the Improvement of Education

Implementing Title IX and Attaining Sex Equity: A Workshop Overview

Participant Worksheet A

Implementing Title IX and Attaining Sex Equity is a workshop designed to assist educators and interested citizens to gain (or to increase):

- an understanding of the manifestations and the effects of sex discrimination and sex bias in education
- an understanding of the requirements of Title IX and its implementing regulation, and of the steps required to achieve compliance
- skills and capability for the development and implementation of policies, programs, and management systems to ensure educational equity

The workshop is based on a fifteen-hour training sequence which is divided into five three-hour workshop sessions. Three of these sessions are called "Generic Sessions;" they are designed to provide general information and experiences which are relevant to all participants attending the workshop. The other two sessions, called "Application Sessions," are designed to provide specialized information and experiences to persons of different professional roles and to enable participants to apply workshop experiences to their individual professional responsibilities. The sequence and titles of the workshop sessions are outlined below:

Generic Session One: "The Context of Title IX"

Generic Session Two: "The Title IX Regulation and Grievance Process"

Application Sessions A and B: Two sequential application sessions focus on the responsibilities and roles of different professional groups with regard to Title IX compliance and the attainment of sex equity in education. The particular groups for which application sessions are offered should be listed on the workshop agenda or by the workshop facilitators.

Generic Session Three: "Planning for Change"

The objectives for Generic Session One include:

- to provide participants with an opportunity to assess their awareness of differential treatment of males and females in their institutions and the impact of Title IX on this differential treatment
- to provide participants with a review of the legal context of Title IX, an overview of Federal antidiscrimination laws, and the opportunity to assess their skills in identifying discrimination in postsecondary institutions

- to provide participants with an understanding of current sex differentiated patterns of participation in postsecondary education and factors and barriers influencing women's participation in postsecondary education
- to encourage participants to identify goals for nonsexist postsecondary education

The objectives for Generic Session Two include:

- to review with participants the requirements of the regulation to implement Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972
- to provide participants an opportunity to assess their own understandings of Title IX requirements by sharing questions and answers with others
- to provide participants with an understanding of the significance of Title IX grievance procedures as a method for resolving complaints of sex discrimination and for monitoring Title IX compliance
- to provide participants with information regarding the structural components or characteristics of an effective grievance procedure and an opportunity to evaluate the structure of several sample grievance procedures
- to increase participants' understanding of and skills related to their own potential responsibilities for grievance problem solving
- to provide participants an opportunity to increase their skills in identifying Title IX violations and in formulating corrective or remedial actions appropriate to these violations through the analysis of sample Title IX grievances

The objectives for Generic Session Three include:

- to provide participants with an overview of some of the necessary conditions for change related to Title IX and sex equity in education and of the types of strategies available for planning and implementing change efforts in these areas
- to provide participants with a framework for diagnosing organizational change needs related to Title IX and sex equity and for designing action strategies which would be appropriate for meeting these needs
- to provide participants with an opportunity to develop preliminary plans for organizational change which could contribute to the full implementation of Title IX and achieving sex equity in their institutions
- to increase participants' skills in developing action programs related to Title IX and sex equity for implementation in their own job functioning

Although the specific objectives of the Application Sessions vary according to the group for which the session is designed, all Application Sessions are generally designed to provide participants with the opportunity to:

- identify the implications of Title IX for their own job functions
- increase their skills for identifying and alleviating sex discrimination and for providing sex equity in their own job functions
- consider actions which can be taken in their own job functions to ensure Title IX compliance and increase sex equity in their education institutions

IMPLEMENTING TITLE IX AND ATTAINING SEX EQUITY--
AN INTRODUCTORY ASSESSMENT

Worksheet 1

Think about the policies, practices, and programs of the education institution in which you work and the behavior of administrators, faculty, and staff members.

1. List as many examples as you can identify of differential opportunity or treatment of female and male students, administrators, faculty, and/or staff.

2. What efforts have been taken to eliminate sex differentiation and increase sex equity in opportunity or treatment of students, administrators, faculty, and/or staff?

3. What, in your opinion, has been the significance or contribution of Title IX in eliminating differential opportunities and treatment of female and male students? Of female and male administrators, faculty, and/or staff?

4. What, in your opinion, are the steps which should be taken in the future to facilitate Title IX implementation and the achievement of sex equity in your institution?

IDENTIFYING DISCRIMINATION--CASE EXAMPLES

Worksheet 2

Please read through each of the examples below to determine the possible areas of discrimination or probable violations of Federal law or executive order. Make a note of the law(s) or order you believe is(are) relevant to each example in the space provided.

Background Information

State University is responsible for the education of 18,000 students, 6,000 of whom are enrolled in professional or graduate programs of study. The student population consists of approximately eight percent Black students, two percent Hispanic students, one and one-half percent Asian students, and one-half of one percent Native American students. Sixty percent of the students are male and forty percent are female. The majority of the minority students are concentrated in the fields of allied medical sciences, sociology, social work, and education.

The part-time and full-time faculty, administrators and counselors number nearly 2,000 persons; 800 of this group are in tenured positions, 600 are on career ladders leading to tenure, and 600 are noncareer ladder part-time and full-time faculty and staff. Although nearly 20 percent of the total faculty and staff is female (400), only 16 women hold tenured positions. Six Black males in the social work and education departments are tenured, while the remaining 45 minority group faculty are nontenured. Two Hispanic males employed in the Latin American studies department have taught in the University for five years and are nontenured. The Medical School has no tenured female faculty and two Asian American males who are tenured. The Law School has one tenured Black male professor and one white female tenured professor.

The University currently receives a total of $2 million in grants and contracts from the Federal government and receives funds under the Public Health Service Act.

Example 1

Ms. Terry and Mr. Greenberg have taught in the English department since September 1973. Both have completed all course work for the doctoral degree and are in the process of completing their doctoral dissertations. Ms. Terry teaches three sections of Freshman Composition and one section of Renaissance Literature, while Mr. Greenberg teaches Medieval Literature, Shakespeare, and one section of Freshman Composition. Ms. Terry was initially hired at a salary of $9,800 and has received increases of $200 each year. Mr. Greenberg was hired at a salary of $10,000 and has been given subsequent increases of $500 each year. Ms. Terry and Mr. Greenberg received comparable performance ratings from students and colleagues.

Relevant law(s):

Example 2

State University has a placement service for students at all levels--undergraduate students, graduating seniors, and students of graduate schools. Although both men and women participate in all the divisions and schools of State University, the placement service maintains separate job listings for men and women and for members of racial-ethnic minority groups because some of the participating employers have stated that they will not accept referrals of students of a particular sex or ethnic group.

Mr. Brown, a Black male, ten credits short of a degree in business, was not informed of summer openings in his field and was referred to several camp counseling jobs. Mr. Smith, a white classmate in the business department, obtained a summer position in an accounting firm on referral from the placement service.

Relevant law(s):

Example 3

Ms. Temple, a Black female, will receive her B.A. degree in art history from State University next June. Despite an exemplary academic record, she was not informed of scholarship opportunities for overseas study. When the selection of students receiving scholarships for overseas study was announced by the University, the group consisted of four white males and two white females, all of whom had been notified of the opportunity by the chair of the art history department.

Relevant law(s):

Example 4

State University requires all unmarried female undergraduate students to live in university residence halls on campus. The space for such students is limited, so a cutoff of applications of female unmarried students is made when the residence halls have been filled. No similar cutoff for male admissions is necessary since unmarried males may live in off-campus housing.

Relevant law(s):

Example 5

When the Black Students Alliance was formed nine years ago, the University provided the 79 student organization a meeting room in the basement of an old classroom building. The Alliance now has a membership of 543. Eight months ago, an astrological organization was formed. The Students for Psychical Astrology, which has a registered membership of 131, was provided semipermanent headquarters in four rooms of the newly constructed student activities complex.

All of the other student groups, composed primarily of white students, have been provided similar semipermanent headquarters. The Black Students Alliance, composed primarily of Black students, has not yet been offered similar semipermanent headquarters.

Relevant law(s):

Example 6

Comprehensive medical insurance is provided for faculty and students of State University. Gynecological care for female faculty and students is exempted from coverage under this insurance although no exemptions are made in the coverage of male faculty and students.

Relevant law(s):

Example 7

The competitive sports program for women at State University has traditionally been limited to participation in competitive basketball and volleyball. Although intercollegiate and intramural teams are provided for women in these sports, the program can serve only a limited number of interested female students. Further, these women's teams are not provided support equal to that provided for men's teams. Female students must provide their own uniforms, and pay their own expenses during travel to games.

Recently a new fieldhouse was completed. The new facilities include a pool which will be used by the men's varsity swimming team. The University Athletic Department has made plans to provide a women's swimming team which will use the old, nonregulation size pool that has been abandoned.

Relevant law(s):

Example 8

Ms. Valdez has completed three years of teaching in the School of Education. After two and one-half years, she applied and was considered for tenure. She received notification that tenure was denied because she had recently married Mr. Cruz who already held a tenured position within the University. It is a regular practice of faculty committees within the University to deny tenure to female faculty on grounds of nepotism, although no such denial is required by University personnel policies.

Relevant law(s):

Example 9

Some three years ago, Mr. LaBelle, a Black male, was approached about accepting the position of affirmative action officer for the University. It was suggested that if he performed well in this job, it would increase his chances of obtaining a central administrative position in the University. Mr. LaBelle accepted the offer; he was worked hard in his position as affirmative action officer and has received commendations for his performance.

During the past year Mr. LaBelle has applied for other central administrative jobs when openings were available. Each time he has been interviewed and told that his fine qualifications have been recognized, but that it is not possible to promote him to another job right now since the affirmative action position requires a minority staff person to give it credibility.

Relevant law(s):

Example 10

Dr. Como, a faculty member in the School of Allied Health Professions, has an M.D. degree and several years of teaching experience working directly with students enrolled in dental technician programs. Although she has worked as a colleague with Dr. Epstein since he joined the faculty two years after her arrival, she finds that she is being paid $4,000 less salary despite the fact that they occupy equivalent positions. It is also clear that Dr. Epstein has been encouraged to develop proposals for the funding of additional projects, while she has struggled for a year to gain approval of the School to apply for outside funding.

Relevant law(s):

NONSEXIST INSTITUTIONS--HOW WOULD THEY LOOK?

Worksheet 3

Listed below are a number of the areas in which sex discrimination and sex bias are manifest in institutions of postsecondary education. Under each, write the characteristics of the area as it might exist if it were free from sex discrimination and sex bias.

I. Institutional policies and practices related to student participation

- admissions and policies practices

- financial aid policies and practices

- policies regarding student residence and enrollment

- others

II. Student programs

- counseling services

- health services

- special services/programs

- athletics

- others

III. The content of the curriculum/research and academic disciplines

IV. The status of women in postsecondary education employment

V. Other

APPENDIX

IDENTIFYING DISCRIMINATION--ANALYSES OF CASE EXAMPLES

Appendix A

(For Worksheet 2)

Example 1

Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, Executive Order 11246, and the Equal Pay Act:

Male and female instructors carrying out equivalent job responsibilities must be paid comparably. Sex differentiation in pay (either in initial pay level and/or periodic increases) without evidence of substantial differences in the job functions or assignments is discriminatory.

Example 2

Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act, Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments, and Executive Order 11246:

Maintenance of job referral lists on the basis of race or sex is clearly in violation of Titles VI, VII, and IX. The University is also subject to Executive Order 11246 by virtue of its Federal contracts and grants.

Example 3

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act:

Practices that provide differential treatment of students on the basis of race are prohibited by Title VI. Discrimination on the basis of race in the notification of students regarding financial assistance opportunities would be prohibited.

Example 4

Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments:

Differential housing requirements for female and male students violate Title IX requirements for nondiscrimination in the treatment of students. Use of such policies as a means of limiting the admissions of females would also be in violation of Title IX regulation requirements for nondiscrimination in admissions to public undergraduate institutions.

Example 5

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act:

Title VI prohibitions of race discrimination apply to most activities of a recipient education institution. Differential treatment of Black students with regard to access to school facilities would be clearly discriminatory.

Example 6

Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, and Executive Order 11246:

Differential provision of medical insurance and health services for male and female students and employees is prohibited by Title IX. Differential health services and benefits for female faculty members is also in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights and Executive Order 11246.

Example 7

Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments:

The regulation implementing Title IX requires that education institutions effectively accommodate the interests and abilities of students of both sexes in club, intramural, interscholastic, and intercollegiate athletics. In providing this opportunity, institutions must ensure that male and female athletes are not treated differentially with regard to such variables as:

- provision of equipment and supplies
- scheduling of games and practice times
- provision of travel and per diem allowances
- coaching and academic tutoring
- locker room, practice and competitive facilities

and several others. The case [illegible] indicates that the University does not adequately meet the interests [illegible]males in its athletic programs and does not provide support for the fema[illegible] do participate in athletics which is equal to that provided for male at[illegible] Such practices are prohibited by Title IX.

Example 8

Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, and Executive Order 11246:

Although the Title IX regulation does not prohibit nepotism rules, they are prohibited when applied in a manner which results in a disparate impact on one sex. In this situation, the lack of policy specification would contribute to the potentially selective use of a nepotism prohibition as a practice to deny tenure to females on the basis of personal preferences or biases.

Example 9

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and Executive Order 11246:

The assignment of an employee to a position on the basis of race would be a violation of equal opportunity principles. An applicant or employee is legally entitled to consideration for positions on the basis of his/her qualifications for those positions and without regard to his/her race.

Example 10

Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, Executive Order 11246, Titles VII and VIII of the Public Health Services Act, and the Equal Pay Act:

The differential payment of male and female employees carrying out equivalent jobs is discriminatory. It is prohibited by the laws and the order listed.